The Dissertation Committee for Sharan Leigh Daniel Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Rhetoric and Journalism as Common Arts of Public Discourse: A Theoretical, Historical, and Critical Perspective

Committee:

_____
Rosa A. Eberly, Supervisor

_____
D. Charles Whitney

_____
Linda Ferreira-Buckley

_____
Patricia Roberts-Miller

_____
Michael Schudson

Rhetoric and Journalism as Common Arts of Public Discourse: A Theoretical, Historical, and Critical Perspective

by

Sharan Leigh Daniel, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August, 2002

Dedication

To my mother and father

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge and thank my advisor, Rosa A. Eberly, and committee members D. Charles Whitney, Linda Ferreira-Buckley, Patricia Roberts-Miller, and Michael Schudson for their generous, thoughtful assistance. Others who shared their insights include Frederick J. Antczak, Gerard A. Hauser, Patricia L. Stewart, Katherine H. Adams, Charles Paine, Janet M. Atwill, Steve Weinberg, Richard A. Cherwitz, and Thomas J. Darwin. From members of my writing group, Julia A. Garbus, David Gold, and Lynda C. Walsh, I received invaluable criticism, gentle but incisive. Special thanks go to my husband, Robin M. Selk, for supporting and encouraging me in countless ways that promoted the completion of this work.

Rhetoric and Journalism as Common Arts of Public Discourse:
A Theoretical, Historical, and Critical Perspective

Publication No._____

Sharan Leigh Daniel, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2002

Supervisor: Rosa A. Eberly

This dissertation examines historical and conceptual intersections between rhetoric and journalism to facilitate interaction among professors of the two subjects. Although many rhetoricians and journalists claim common ends of invigorating democratic politics, academic separation obscures these common ends and inhibits interdisciplinary interaction. The thesis of this work is that professors of journalism and rhetoric who endeavor to promote effective democratic discourse can and should seek means of collaborating to enact and foster the kinds of public participation they envision.

Chapter one finds compatible notions of democratic discourse processes presented by rhetoricians, journalists, and communication scholars. Synthesizing treatments across disciplines of publics, public spheres, public opinion, and press

roles, the chapter offers a normative model showing how journalism and rhetoric can interact to realize publics and public opinion.

Chapters two through four illuminate developments in academic and public life that led to the disciplinary separation of rhetoric and journalism at the turn of the twentieth century, using as case studies Fred Newton Scott's teaching and Ida M. Tarbell's practice of public discourse. This examination suggests that some major historic differences between the subjects are now passé. As journalism entered the academy, rhetoric was perceived as an academic and literary subject with little connection to public life. Scott's program of rhetoric and journalism at the University of Michigan, discussed in chapter two, illustrates public-academic tensions that separated the subjects. His neoplatonic rhetoric differs significantly from the Aristotelian and Isocratean practices that have since been revived among rhetoricians. Chapter three investigates professional impulses in rhetoric and journalism, as composition-rhetoric strove toward disciplinary status and journalism became a distinct vocation. College journalism followed extra-academic professional influences more than it did the rhetorical traditions then espoused in composition-rhetoric programs. As the study of Ida M. Tarbell demonstrates in chapter four, muckraking was more a rhetoric of public engagement than what was being taught by many rhetoricians in the early twentieth century.

Chapter five considers pedagogical implications of preceding theoretical and historical-critical insights, suggesting potential avenues for mutually

beneficial interdisciplinary engagement among journalists, rhetoricians, and their students.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: CITIZENS' AND JOURNALISTS' RHETORICS 1

Introduction: Current Implications of a Historic Disciplinary Separation 1
Rhetoric and Journalism: Interrelated Technai of Public Discourse 4
The Missing Connections in Current Scholarship 8
An Outline of the Current Project 14

Democratic Topoi in Rhetoric and Journalism 18
Democracy and Publics Theory 24
Institutional Configurations 28
Sense-Making Processes 35
Summary 51

Journalism and Rhetoric in the Public Sphere: Toward an Integrative Model 52
Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and Public Knowledge 53
Rhetoric of Weak, Strong, and Hybrid Publics 56
Journalists' Rhetoric and Public Opinion 61
Rhetoric that Promotes Public Opinion Formation 67
Conclusion: Monitorial Citizens and Potential Publics 71

CHAPTER 2: THE UNEASY ALLIANCE OF JOURNALISM AND RHETORIC UNDER FRED NEWTON SCOTT 75

Introduction: A Uniquely Instructive Historical Case 75
A Perplexing Situation 78
A Significant Tension 86

University Life as Scott Knew It 87
Institutional Flux and Innovation 88
Rhetorical Curricula as Indicative of Change 95

Integration of Public and Academic Concerns at the University of Michigan 99
James Burrill Angell: Ambiguity and Contradiction in Utilitarian Aims . 103
"Harvardization" of Composition-Rhetoric and of the University of Michigan 108
Liberal-Vocational Tensions in Scott's Work 115
Educational Aims and Associated Rhetorical Traditions 120
Scott's Theory: Journalism as a Branch of Rhetorical Study and Practice 127
Scott's Pedagogy: Aspiring to Platonic Ideals 141
Scott's Journalism Curriculum: Liberal-Vocational Tensions 148
CHAPTER 3: THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF RHETORIC AND JOURNALISM: ELEMENTS OF A SHARED HISTORY 159
Introduction 159
Rhetorical Education in the Nineteenth Century 163
Overview 163
Rhetoric in College 168
Texts and Precedents 173
Interpretations and Implications 177
Science 183
Humanism 185
Professionalism 193
Rhetoric outside of College 199
Journalism in the Nineteenth Century 201
Overview 201
Journalism outside of College 203
Journalism from 1801 to 1865 205
Journalism from 1865 to 1920 211
Belle Lettres and Science Converge in 1890s Journalism 213

Journalism in College 219

Conclusion: Rhetoric's Separation from Public Processes 231

CHAPTER 4: IDA M. TARBELL, RHETOR 234

Introduction 234

Ida Tarbell, Rhetor 236

Traversing Genre Boundaries 239

Understanding Contrasts in Tarbell's Work 240

Tarbell's Career as a Rhetor 243

How Biology Led to Rhetoric 245

Journalism as Social Research Put to Public Use 250

Economic versus Rhetorical Autonomy 253

Educating Citizens through Journalism 258

Reading Tarbell's Journalism as Rhetoric 264

Muckraking as Epideictic Rhetoric 268

Epideictic Rhetoric's Public-Building Potential 272

Progressive Muckrakers and their Audiences 276

Tarbell's Muckraking: Invoking Publics and Citizens 279

An Epideictic of Women's Citizenship 289

Tarbell's "Progressive Conservative" Politics 305

Conclusion 312

CHAPTER 5: INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND TEACHING IN RHETORIC AND JOURNALISM: HOW AND WHY 315

Introduction 315

Integrating Rhetoric and Journalism Research: A Rationale 316

Compatible Ideas of Public Participation and a Heuristic Theory 316

Historic Basis for Separation: A Thing of the Past (Mostly) 322

Potential Gains of Increased Interdisciplinary Research 326

Integrating Rhetoric and Journalism Through Teaching: Potential Gains 329
Rhetoric-Public Journalism Connections 329
Rhetoric-Investigative Journalism Connections 334
Conclusion 335
WORKS CITED **337**
Archival Collections 337
Books, Articles, and Other Sources 337
VITA **355**

Chapter 1: Citizens' and Journalists' Rhetorics

INTRODUCTION: CURRENT IMPLICATIONS OF A HISTORIC DISCIPLINARY SEPARATION

Rhetoric and journalism have not always been separate disciplines, as they are now, in US higher education. College journalism instruction first appeared, along with creative, technical, and business writing, as advanced rhetoric or composition in English departments at the turn of the twentieth century. However, as Katherine H. Adams shows in A History of Professional Writing Instruction in American Colleges, the rhetoric-journalism connection was tenuous and often short-lived, particularly at rapidly expanding universities. Almost from the start, professional curricula other than creative writing proved an awkward fit alongside literature and the required courses in composition. At many universities, journalism quickly found institutional support to form its own department or school (Adams, A History 13-14,147-48).[1] Adams suggests that

[1] A notable exception to this general pattern was the journalism program at the University of Michigan, which began in the Department of Rhetoric in 1903 and remained there until 1926. I take up this special case and its ramifications for our understanding of journalism and rhetoric teaching today, in chapter two. In addition, journalism and rhetoric were and are often still found together in departments of English or communication at smaller universities and colleges. A more comprehensive current survey of journalism instruction, and one of rhetoric instruction, would be helpful to both fields, however. A 1940 study of journalism instruction in four-year US colleges suggests the range of arrangements in journalism: 1) schools and departments belonging to the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism (formed in 1917, now the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications); 2) other schools and departments offering degrees or majors; 3) other units, "usually within English Departments--offering combined English-Journalism majors" or journalism minors; and 4) more limited programs, usually in English departments,

the specialization of advanced writing instruction was not all for the better; it secluded enclaves of writing faculty who faced common pedagogical and administrative challenges. Now, she notes, as writing-career categories become less distinct and corresponding instructional issues converge, writing teachers segregated by specialty do not enjoy enough opportunities to share wisdom and experience (A History 150-54).

This academic development has even farther-reaching implications in public life. The disciplinary separation of journalism and rhetoric in particular almost certainly affects the quality of public discourse and opinion that are presumed to guide our democracy. Taught by separate faculties who rarely interact with one another, future journalists and other citizens receive disparate understandings of the processes of public-opinion formation and their own porential to participate in those processes. Such separation is unlikely to foster communication between journalists and the citizenry they serve, a goal deemed important by professionals in journalism (e.g., Broder, "A New Assignment"; Carey, "Community, Public, and Journalism"; Christians; Fallows; Fouhy; Lambeth, "Public Journalism as Democratic Practice"; Merritt; Rosen, Getting the Connections Right). Journalists, these authors argue, shape citizens' attitudes

---

offering several journalism courses, some of which may count toward an English major (Sutton 3). At the same time, the data from this survey support the general trend of early separation that Adams observes. While only 21 percent (88) of the 415 programs surveyed fell into the first two categories of accredited or non-accredited schools and departments by 1940, most of the earliest programs had become separate entities. By 1915 some kind of journalism training was offered in 50 of the institutions surveyed; 36 of these by 1940 had schools or departments of journalism (Sutton 19).

about politics; rather than engaging citizens in public affairs, journalists too often drive citizens away by presenting politics as an insider's game with no room for citizens' involvement except as spectators. Journalists have aligned themselves with the political elite more than with the ordinary citizen; in doing so, these authors maintain, journalists have eroded public trust in news media and in government at once.[2]

Adams poses a similar problem in Progressive Politics and the Training of America's Persuaders. Again grouping together specialists in journalism, advertising, creative writing, and public relations, she emphasizes the power they share over citizens without professional communication training. She argues that Progressive-Era educators devoted their best efforts to professional writing curricula in college and to language skills at the elementary level, neglecting general rhetorical education at secondary and post-secondary levels. Adams implicates Progressives like Bob LaFollette and Willard Bleyer, who inaugurated the University of Wisconsin's innovative journalism program, as participants in the creation of an elite class of persuasive communicators (and those who employ them) that could effectively overpower a managerial class of citizens with lesser rhetorical skills. The former she calls Big Persuasion, the latter, the Unknown Citizen, after W. H. Auden's 1939 poem of that title (145-50). This situation continues, she suggests, with sophisticated instruction in persuasion still weighted heavily in favor of professional communicators.

[2] Communication scholars have expressed similar concerns; in addition to those discussed later in this chapter, see Cappella and Jamieson, and Hart.

Rhetoric and Journalism: Interrelated Technai of Public Discourse

Adams' position does not engage journalism's long-held claims of special importance to democratic political life, such as its functions of publicizing political processes to help keep government responsive to the people and of providing people with information they need to make good decisions in self-government. These claims, which support the concept of press freedom and gave rise to the image of the press as a "Fourth Estate" in politics,[3] also underpin journalism's significant conceptual and practical connection with rhetoric. Understood as a citizen's art of public discourse--of which persuasion is just one aspect--rhetoric has more in common with journalism than Adams' works imply. Rhetoric originated with democracy in ancient Athens, where the first rhetoricians known to us in Western history were concerned with preparing citizens to participate in public forums (see, e.g., Bizzell and Herzberg 21-22; Golden, Berquist, and Coleman 6-7; Katula and Murphy 2). It is with this understanding that many professors, though not all, approach and teach the subject today, as explained below.

In rhetorical terms, professors of journalism and rhetoric are concerned primarily with imparting the technai (plural of technē--art, craft, or know-how) central to public opinion formation, expression, and interpretation. Among ancient Greeks, technē referred to the type of knowledge entailed not only in rhetoric but also in other arts of doing or making (poiēsis), such as architecture,

[3] The Oxford English Dictionary finds this usage of the term appearing possibly as early as the 1820s and certainly by 1837 in England.

medicine, poetry, and navigation (Atwill 6). The invocation of this term--and, throughout this project, others from classical rhetoric--offers a way of thinking about the art of public discourse as imagined and practiced prior to the invention of specialties like journalism and the fraternal twins, composition- and speech-rhetoric. Janet M. Atwill, surveying usage of the word technē in ancient Greek writings, finds that across the many situations to which it is applied, technē denotes an "art of intervention and invention," a flexible, adaptable knowledge that enables its possessor to address situations in flux (7, 48, 70-100). Rhetoric in the technē tradition explicated by Atwill is an art of discourse by which people intervene in matters of common concern and invent new possibilities for themselves as a public. As I argue in the last section of this chapter, this understanding of rhetoric as a flexible art of public discourse and reasoning, responsive to the particular contexts in which it is deployed, is of value to both journalists and rhetoricians who endeavor to promote various forms of public participation.

The assumption of a connection--more precisely, one gone bad--between journalists and their publics forms the basis of the "public journalism" movement begun in the 1990s, a development that has stimulated considerable research.[4] Movement founders point to coverage of the 1988 US presidential campaign as a

[4] Two collections of articles present an array of perspectives and methods (Black; Lambeth, Meyer, and Thorson). In addition, public journalism is the main topic of more than a dozen master's and doctoral theses published since 1995; among them are Bare, Compton, Kraeplin, Martin, Schroll, and Zang. The Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication also has a Civic Journalism division.

particularly low point in recent journalism history that awakened them to the need for reforms.[5] Concerned about journalists' venal portrayal of politics and their decreasing approval ratings in polls, journalism professor Jay Rosen and journalist Davis "Buzz" Merritt began discussions with others in the profession that led to initiatives among news organizations that sought to involve communities in setting the news agendas of local media. To sponsor public-journalism reforms, Rosen and Merritt started the Project on Public Life and the Press, supported by the Kettering Foundation and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation (Rosen, Getting the Connections Right; Merritt, Public Journalism and Public Life). Similar reforms took shape under the direction of former television journalist Ed Fouhy at the Pew Center for Civic Journalism, sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trusts (Fouhy).[6]

---

[5] As Fallows notes, public-journalism advocates often write of "epiphanies" arising out of reflections on coverage that focused on "bringing out the worst in every participant in public life" (248-49). Fallows fairly sums up the 1988 coverage that gave journalists pause about their role in the political process: stories "about the Dukakis campaign's response to the Bush campaign's attacks, about Gary Hart and his girl friends, about what Willie Horton did or did not do, about what Michael Dukakis would or would not do if his wife was raped" (249). Journalists also became alarmed at their approval ratings in opinion polls, frequently citing a 1994 Times-Mirror survey that reported 71 percent of Americans agreed with the statement, "'The news media get in the way of society's solving its problems'" (qtd. in Merritt, "Public Journalism and Public Life" 262).

[6] The Pew-sponsored reforms took the name "civic journalism." Civic and public journalism are so similar that most researchers combine them under one title, "public journalism," as I do here. Meyer and Potter propose "citizen-based journalism" to encompass both. Subtle differences do exist between civic and public journalism, beyond their sponsorship. These differences appear mainly in the types of organizations and methods most frequently involved in each, although even these distinctions are not airtight. While both movements include

Rosen explains that public journalism aims to encourage "a healthier public discourse, a citizenry more inclined to participate, a civic culture that engages more people than it repels" ("First Principles" 18). Such democratic-minded ideas of journalism reform are not altogether new. As Renita Coleman argues in "The Intellectual Antecedents of Public Journalism," issues raised in the 1990s can be seen as evolving from those debated by Walter Lippmann and John Dewey in the 1920s and revisited by the 1947 Commission on Freedom of the Press (known as the "Hutchins Commission"). Current reforms have drawn criticism from journalists, though, who see them as violating prevailing standards of objectivity (e.g., Bennet, Buckner and Gartner, Corrigan, Kelly, Yardley). Others, like Broder, Fallows, and Hamill, are more sympathetic. Academics tend to support at least the movement's aims (e.g., Black; Lambeth, Meyer, and Thorson). Critics and advocates alike have entered into and stimulated a wider discussion among scholars in journalism, communication, and political science about the media's actual and possible roles in support of information-age democracy (e.g., Capella and Jamieson; Entman; Hart; Johnson, Hays, and Hays; Postman).

---

print and broadcast news organizations, civic journalism efforts more often include broadcast news, especially television, while public journalism often entails newspaper-only efforts. Civic journalism also tends to use more single-issue projects such as soliciting public participation in ridding a neighborhood of crime (see Fouhy; Schaffer and Miller). Public journalism tends to focus on changing newsroom attitudes and practices that affect routine reporting (see Merritt; Lambeth).

The Missing Connections in Current Scholarship

These discussions tend to concentrate more on professional practices in journalism than on journalists' and citizens' education in public discourse. For example, Engaging the Public, a collection of research valuable for the range of fields and perspectives it represents, does not raise the topic of journalists' education, although it considers citizens' education, albeit at primary and secondary levels (McDeavitt and Chaffee; McLeod, Eveland, and Horowitz). Jack McLeod, William Eveland, and Edward Horowitz suggest that public journalism can enhance the effectiveness of programs such as Kids Voting, by fostering a sense of efficacy among local citizens (200-201). Bruce Pinkleton and Erica Weintraub Austin confirm that news media can enhance citizens' feelings of efficacy, which in turn positively affect political involvement, when citizens approach the media with realistic expectations; e.g., when they do not look to half-hour television news for in-depth discussion (82-86). The editors, in their concluding "Agenda for Reform," also endorse public journalism as a means of engaging the public (Johnson, Hays, and Hays 223-36). However, one might well ask whether reformers' efforts would not have a better chance of success if citizens were predisposed to the type of coverage offered by public journalism--if they knew what to expect, as Pinkleton and Austin suggest. What if the colleges that offer courses in public journalism to journalism majors also educated other students on these reforms and their aims? What if journalism majors learned something of rhetoric, to see how some of their classmates learn to engage in public discussion? These kinds of connections, taken up in chapter five, are

overlooked by research that addresses either journalists' or citizens' discourse practices, but not both.

Another important collection, Public Opinion and the Communication of Consent, assembles insights from scholars in communication, journalism, sociology, and political science to illuminate many aspects of public-opinion formation and consultation. Yet it, too, gives little attention to issues of education. The collection, as Elihu Katz claims in the introduction, brings together scholarship heretofore segmented into different disciplinary venues to "treat public opinion and mass communication as elements in a single system, rather than as two separate systems" (xxi). In this respect it demonstrates the connection between what journalism professors teach ("mass communication") and what rhetoricians teach (citizens' formation of communal judgments or "public opinion"). And, unlike Engaging the Public, this book includes historical perspectives that hint at connections between journalism and rhetoric.

Harry C. Boyte, for instance, argues that public opinion should be conceived as "public judgment," singling out "civic education" as a priority in facilitating publics' assertions of such judgment (432). His description of public-opinion formation is consistent with the technē tradition of rhetoric; he even invokes the Greek concept of phronēsis, or practical wisdom (422-23, 428), which Aristotle finds essential to effective employment of rhetoric on behalf of the public good. However, Boyte mentions neither Aristotle nor rhetoric, the art considered by its ancient and contemporary teachers as central to civic education.[7]

[7] Not all ancient rhetorics and their associated ideas of civic education are alike. Atwill makes an important distinction between the enkuklios paideia, or

John Durham Peters also draws upon ancient Greek thought in discussing historical antecedents of the term "public opinion." He notes the different values that Plato and Aristotle assigned to doxa (commonly held beliefs or contingent truths), as well as the diverging political philosophies that emerge from these different values. But he does not mention rhetoric, the means of reasoning that Aristotle assigned to the realm of doxa ("Historical Tensions" 4-5).

These articles affirm the potential interrelation of journalism and rhetoric in a "single system" of public opinion formation, expression, and circulation. As with the discussions on public journalism and citizen engagement, they also imply that it is no small matter if, in college, journalists and other citizens acquire disparate understandings of a key feature in democratic life--the formation and uses of public opinion. Moreover they indicate that journalists and rhetoricians may not be sufficiently aware of each other's work to benefit from the range of perspectives offered in current scholarship.

Adams' Progressive Politics further reveals the overlapping interests among speech- and composition-rhetoric, journalism, communication, and other politically oriented fields in the historical roots of separation between journalism and rhetoric. For example, Adams' marked concern for the fate of common

---

common, general education, associated with logōn technē and represented in the works of Protagoras, Isocrates, and Aristotle, and the humanist tradition of education derived from Plato and associated with the Roman rhetorician Quintilian, and to some extent, with Cicero (4-69). Whereas the Greek paideia emphasized the transformative power of rhetoric, the humanist tradition emphasized the preservation of cultural tradition and hence, aimed at producing a stable, normative subject rather than a subject responsive to and informed by contextual norms (Atwill 29-30).

rhetorical training reflects an orientation characteristic of professors in composition-rhetoric, a field that grew in the twentieth century largely by establishing writing pedagogy as a legitimate scholarly enterprise after the introduction of college writing requirements in the 1870s.[8] Her argument resonates especially with rhetoricians' criticism that composition programs at the turn of the century diverted their attention from traditions of civic discourse to focus on style, form, and correctness (1-20, 33-38, 148-49).[9]

---

[8] See Robert J. Connors' history of the discipline, Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy. Using "composition-rhetoric" to denote the field of college composition that grew out of rhetoric in this country beginning in 1870, he claims it is unique in the academy as a "field decreed necessary and continued by social fiat" (7). The field's central concern with pedagogy is reflected in his book as well as others that investigate aspects of the discipline's history by exploring classroom practices, principles of teaching, and textbooks. Prominent examples dealing with general composition-rhetoric curricula include James A. Berlin's Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges and Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985; John C. Brereton's The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925; Sharon Crowley's The Methodical Memory : Invention in Current-Traditional Rhetoric and Composition in the University; Nan Johnson's Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America; and Albert R. Kitzhaber's Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900.

[9] A general condemnation of turn-of-the-century writing instruction called "current-traditional" featured prominently in the revival of rhetoric among composition professors, beginning mid-twentieth century and gathering momentum in the 1970s and 80s. The term, coined by Richard E. Young in the phrase "current-traditional paradigm," came to refer to a pedagogical approach, prevalent through the first half of the twentieth century and still in evidence. Current-traditional most often describes teaching or textbooks that emphasize skills (in usage, grammar, mechanics, and style) and modes of discourse (description, narration, exposition, and argumentation or persuasion), which are valued for their transferability across settings (Winterowd 48-49, 89-90, 99-100). Sharon Crowley's Methodical Memory, a book-length critique of this method, is an often-cited source. An earlier criticism, also widely consulted, appeared in Albert R. Kitzhaber's 1953 dissertation, Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-

In tracing the transportation of Progressive ideas into propaganda efforts during and after World War I, Adams' work also echoes concerns raised in journalism and communication that seep into many other fields. The situation she deftly describes prompted a debate among journalists, sociologists, philosophers, and psychologists in the 1920s that would later be joined by scholars in communication over the role of public opinion in a mass democracy.[10] As mentioned above Walter Lippmann's 1922 Public Opinion and John Dewey's 1927 The Public and Its Problems captured the problem of "the bewildered public" in a massive state. These works sketched the contours of a widespread,

---

1900, issued as a book in 1990. Critiques that foreground the neglect of rhetoric as preparation for participatory citizenship include Berlin's Writing Instruction and Rhetoric and Reality; Michael Halloran's "From Rhetoric to Composition"; and Halloran and Gregory Clark's introduction to Oratorical Culture in Nineteenth-Century America.

Other scholars are more sympathetic with the aims and methods known as "current-traditional." Connors offers a cogent critique of the somewhat confusing term and its usage, while acknowledging that there is a "coherent tradition" of instruction based on helping students to locate and use "elements of correct and successful writing"--the tradition that he renames "composition-rhetoric" (5-7). Charles Paine, while not endorsing "current-traditional" method, shows that some of its originators were much more concerned with public discourse practices than their textbooks, taken out of context, reveal.

[10] John Durham Peters notes that although "communication theory" did not appear until the 1940s, its main issues were intensely debated in the 1920s (Speaking into the Air 9-10). Among them is the problem of "large-scale communication to the many, be they 'crowd,' 'mass,' 'people,' or 'public'" (10). On this topic he cites Lippmann and Dewey, which I discuss, as well as other works, including Edward Bernays, Crystallizing Public Opinion (1923); George Lukács, History and Class Consciousness (1923); Harold Lasswell, Propaganda Technique in the World War (1927); Sigmund Freud, Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego (1922); and Carl Schmitt, The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy (1923, 1926).

perennial debate over whether citizens could or should be roused to participate in the increasingly complex political affairs of their vast nation (see Coleman). Lippmann felt that the workings of government and industry, compounded by the unreliability he attributed to language itself, were beyond the average citizen's grasp. Furthermore, they were beyond the capacity of the press to monitor accurately. He proposed an elite cadre of government experts to serve as a check on the journalists. Dewey asserted that if the public was "in eclipse" it needed to be reawakened, rather than watched over. His answer to the problem lay in education and communication; only through improved "means and ways of communication" (155) could members of the Great Society transform themselves into the Great Community by recognizing their collective interests. Discussion continues on this issue of the mass public's role in self-government, and with renewed urgency, as people's lives become reorganized socially, politically, and economically in response to digital technology and Internet media.[11]

---

[11] See especially James W. Carey's "The Press, Public Opinion, and Public Discourse." Beyond the discussions on public journalism and civic engagement mentioned earlier, scholars in journalism, communication, and rhetoric have also reopened Dewey's issue of the potential for publics to form and act. Interest in this issue burgeoned especially after the 1989 publication of The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere by Jürgen Habermas in English translation, as discussed below. Jay Rosen's advocacy of public journalism grew out of his investigation into the Dewey-Lippmann debate in his dissertation (Merritt 14-16), and his ideas are influenced by Habermas as well (Rosen, "A Case for Public Scholarship"). Other journalism and communication scholars who have extended the debate about journalism's place in a Deweyan or Habermasian public include Robert Anderson, Robert Dardenne, and George Killenberg; James W. Carey ("Community, Public, and Journalism"); Clifford Christians; Peter Dahlgren and Colin Sparks; John Durham Peters ("Historical Tensions"); and Michael Schudson ("Was There Ever a Public Sphere?"). Rhetoricians who use publics theory include Dana Cloud, Rosa Eberly (Citizen

As suggested by Adams' works, those who teach public discourse, regardless of discipline, have an interest in this renewed debate over the possibilities and limits of democratic public life. Furthermore, teaching and scholarship on this issue have broad implications for other fields concerned with public life. Progressive Politics shows as well that the teaching of public discourse can significantly affect democratic processes outside the academy. Adams traces the dispersion of Progressive educators' ideas, and their eventual use in efforts the originators did not foresee, such as public relations for big business and war propaganda. In doing so, she tells a cautionary tale, reminding us that educators have little control over the uses to which their teachings will be applied. For this reason, teachers of public discourse have a special imperative to spread the wealth of rhetorical skill fairly among all students and not just a select few.

An Outline of the Current Project

The problem addressed in this project, then, is the historic separation of journalism and rhetoric as academic disciplines and its implications for the teaching and practice of public discourse today. What might otherwise seem an esoteric matter of intra-academy organization, this topic has a bearing on public affairs, because the disciplines themselves deal with journalists' and citizens' arts of public discourse. In Atwill's terms, professors of rhetoric and journalism teach arts of public intervention and invention. Thus these academics are centrally

---

Critics, "From Audiences and Communities"), Thomas Goodnight, and Gerard Hauser (Vernacular Voices), among others.

concerned with the daily workings of public life. Of course they represent only a small portion of those interested in the discourses that support democracy, as indicated by the recent works reviewed above and others discussed below. This work is intended primarily for those professors in journalism and rhetoric who see their teaching and scholarship in terms of potential impacts on democracy; in addition this work may be of interest to other scholars or practicing journalists with similar concerns.

The project begins and ends by illuminating the democracy-related issues found in research and teaching of journalism and rhetoric. The middle chapters examine the differences that led to the development of separate disciplines; these chapters present a cumulative argument that for a considerable group of scholars in both disciplines, those differences no longer obtain. This project does not seek to combine the disciplines, but merely to point toward potential avenues for interaction that might prove fruitful for both. Its thesis is that professors of journalism and rhetoric who endeavor to promote effective democratic discourse can and should seek means of collaborating to enact and foster the kinds of public participation they envision. This proposal rests on assumptions that disciplinary arrangements and beliefs, deeply rooted in history and theory, might seriously challenge. One problematic assumption is that journalists and rhetoricians can agree on what might constitute "effective democratic discourse" and that they share at least minimally compatible visions of desirable and attainable "public participation" in the current age. Embedded in this assumption is another: that in their history of separation, journalism and rhetoric have not acquired

insurmountable differences in perspective or method that would preclude faculty from effective communication or collaboration across the disciplines. A third assumption is that, if they were to agree on common ends, journalists, rhetoricians, and their students could actually benefit from interdisciplinary collaboration. The major portion of this introductory chapter defends the first assumption; remaining chapters address the last two.

The present chapter examines scholarship in journalism, rhetoric, and works in communication common to both, finding compatible notions of democratic discourse processes. Across disciplines, though, competing liberal and communitarian[12] ideas of democracy imply different concepts of public participation. From an investigation of theoretical and historical treatments of publics, public spheres, public opinion, and the roles of media and rhetoric, a normative model is offered, showing how journalists and other citizens might cooperate effectively in the formation and circulation of public opinion. Within this model, news media are viewed as rhetorical forums, journalism as rhetorical practice, and news as rhetoric. This discussion suggests, in short, that journalism be construed as rhetoric for the purpose of promoting the formation and

[12] I use these terms rather broadly, in an attempt to treat them as they appear in the sources consulted as explained below in the section, "Democratic Topoi in Rhetoric and Journalism." Patricia Roberts-Miller, investigating the political assumptions of composition pedagogy, surveys political theory and identifies no fewer than six "models of democracy: the liberal, interest-based, technocratic, agonistic, communitarian, and deliberative" (1). In her analysis, these categories help distinguish the purposes implicitly served by different theories of composition. Such categories might also be useful in delineating and comparing purposes served by different practices in journalism and rhetoric; such analysis represents a more elaborate treatment of political theory than I offer here.

expression of public opinion and thus activating publics and invigorating public spheres.

The next three chapters illuminate historical developments in academic and public life that led to the disciplinary separation of rhetoric and journalism. At the time journalism entered the academy, the technē tradition of rhetoric was dormant, as shown in chapters two and three. Fred Newton Scott, discussed in chapter two, successfully combined rhetoric and journalism in one department for thirteen years at the University of Michigan. Yet he adhered to a Platonist concept of rhetoric quite different from the Aristotelian ideas that have since been revived among rhetoricians. While rhetorics of composition and speech were developing into disciplines, the profession of journalism established itself outside the academy and apart from these academic traditions, as I discuss in chapter three. Journalism in the academy became more influenced by these professional developments than by those in the academy, as professional journalists forged their own rhetorics of public discourse. As the study of Ida Tarbell shows in chapter four, muckraking was more a rhetoric of public engagement than what was being taught by many rhetoricians in the early decades of the twentieth century. Given recent movements in journalism and rhetoric toward similar ideas of public participation, as shown in this chapter, the current relationship between the teaching of citizens' and journalists' arts of discourse deserves reconsideration. That reconsideration is introduced here by examining current theory and continued in chapter five by discussing some pedagogical implications of this theory.

DEMOCRATIC TOPOI IN RHETORIC AND JOURNALISM

In a recent discussion of rhetoricians' own division into speech and composition disciplines, one participant reveals the common ground that a considerable group of rhetoricians and journalists share: a central interest in democracy and its discourse practices.[13] William Keith, responding to Stephen Mailloux and Michael Leff on the issue of disciplinary identities, suggests that an "animating myth" of democracy distinguishes speech-rhetoric from its composition counterpart (99-104).[14] Generalizing "heuristically," he posits a

[13] Discussion of speech- and composition-rhetoric's cross-disciplinary concerns and their possible institutional, scholarly, and pedagogical implications has recently appeared in some of rhetoric's public arenas. Here I discuss an article and a pair of responses that appeared in Rhetoric Society Quarterly in 2000. In May of that year, the biennial conference of the Rhetoric Society of America contributed to the discussion with a well-attended meeting on "Planning Strategically for the Future of Rhetoric." Another contribution, Rhetoric's Road Trip: Mapping Rhetoric's Institutional Histories in the Twentieth-Century United States, edited by Rosa Eberly and Gerard Hauser, is forthcoming. Eberly and Hauser presented a co-authored chapter of this book at the biennial Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition in 1999.

[14] I use "speech-rhetoric" to refer to the work of rhetoricians in or closely related to the disciplines of speech or communication and "composition-rhetoric" to refer to work in or related to disciplines of composition or English. "Composition-rhetoric" is a term Connors resurrects from Fred Newton Scott and Joseph V. Denney's textbook of that name (Connors 6). While Connors uses the term to refer to a specific rhetorical tradition, "with its own theoria and practice" (7), I use it more loosely, when I find it necessary to acknowledge differences among practices and emphases in rhetorics that have developed in English and communication. Such terms are useful, because not all teachers of speech or composition call themselves rhetoricians, and because there indeed are further differences among rhetoricians in speech-communication and English-composition, as indicated in the works I mention here (Eberly and Hauser, Mailloux, Leff, Keith). Both speech- and composition-rhetoric refer to what is taught, especially to undergraduates. Other terms identify professors or scholars in relation to their departmental affiliations or their fields of research (as I do below in discussing research on democratic discourse). For instance, Steven

polar tension between form and content that has existed since antiquity, when [r]hetoricians with civic community-building purposes positioned themselves against sophists who delighted in the endless play of language (99). Keith presents rhetoricians in speech as having gravitated toward the "civic pole," while the composition field established itself nearer the "formal pole." Moreover, he asserts that the speech-rhetoricians' alignment was deliberate. The movement in speech toward professional communication (parallel to and connected with developments described by Adams) was well underway, yet rhetoricians in speech departments saw themselves as "heirs to the democratic traditions of Athenian rhetoric, and as continuing the development of the Atlantic republican tradition," as Keith says (100). Civic ideals continue to exert a strong influence on teaching and research in the field, he argues, citing popular textbooks as well as scholarship (100-104). He finds "[a] kind of 'vertical integration' unites

---

Mailloux writes of rhetoricians in English Studies and those in Speech Communication, which he shortens to "English and Communication rhetoricians" (5). Michael Leff follows suit with "English-rhetoricians" and "Communication-rhetoricians" (84) before introducing "composition-rhetoric" and "communication-rhetoric" (89), which he adapts to "composition-rhetoricians" and "communication-rhetoricians," sometimes capitalizing the initial "c" in each (90). William Keith, responding to Mailloux and Leff, uses the departmental affiliation, as in "Speech Communication rhetoricians" and "English department rhetoricians." I would advocate (and use) English- and communication-rhetoric rather than composition- and communication-rhetoric, because English is more closely parallel to communication than is composition, since English and Communication are names of broad fields and departments. Composition remains, even today, with its Conference on College Composition and Communication and its own journals, a subfield under the larger heading of English Studies, as Mailloux's terms suggest, and it is rarely the name of a separate department. In this work, I adhere most often to "composition-rhetoric" and "speech-rhetoric" to highlight pedagogical issues and their relationship to public practice.

scholarship with teaching by means of the animating myth; that public address, social movement studies and political communication are species of the genus Rhetoric in Speech Communication is no accident" (100). Keith adds that his own democratic orientation toward rhetoric prevents him from understanding some rhetoricians in English; he does not know "what their animating myth is, or if there is one" (100).

Keith's broad characterizations are, as he allows, inevitably inaccurate, although taken as "common understanding," as he presents them, they seem fair enough. Some of composition-rhetoric's own historical accounts agree that composition identified itself more closely with the "formal pole" early in its history. The "revival of rhetoric" in English departments, which began in the 1950s,[15] spread to composition in the 1960s and 70s as a response to concerns over the teaching of writing and its status in the academy (Berlin, Rhetoric and Reality 115-38; Mailloux 15-17). Both of these concerns had something to do with the perceived emphasis of form over content, a problem that ancient and modern rhetorical theory, with the polar tension that Keith describes, could address. But with the various theories and impulses represented in this revival, it is no surprise that Keith cannot readily locate an animating myth among composition-rhetoricians. Berlin identifies three broad categories of rhetorical approaches in composition: subjective, objective, and transactional, the last

[15] Berlin sees this movement as growing out of general-education programs developed from the Depression onward. Renewed interest in "Aristotelian humanism" at the University of Chicago in the 1950s provided a major impetus for the return to classical rhetoric in English (Rhetoric and Reality 115-119).

further divided into classical, cognitive-psychological, and epistemic (Rhetoric and Reality 140-179). In addition, the movement composition histories usually identify as a dominating factor in the discipline's development emerged in this era as the villain, "current-traditional rhetoric," a collection of teaching methods grouped together and named retrospectively by critics rather than embraced by adherents (Connors 4-6).[16]

What Keith understandably misses, especially considering that his topic is speech-rhetoric's identity, is that some composition-rhetoricians do share a commitment to the civic or democratic ideals that he describes. (I was taught by a few of them, and I am one.)[17] Some perhaps are inspired by a common "animating myth." If so, it might be the one I learned in my orientation as an assistant instructor--and to which I allude above--about rhetoric's arising from the need of newly liberated citizens in ancient Greece to argue for lands that had been confiscated under tyranny (see Katula and Murphy 2). It would be difficult and somewhat beside the point here to estimate the size of this civic-minded subgroup in relation to a rather small community of rhetoricians within composition. Some of their works, however, inform the discussion below of what rhetoricians and journalists mean by democracy.

Animating myths have their limitations, as Keith's discussion illustrates; they do not lend themselves to cross-cultural understanding. In contrast to myth,

---

[16] See note 9.

[17] This statement alludes to a similar one by Keith: "While in the current academic scene it is nothing less than corny to imagine one's discipline as a practical and cultural basis for Democracy, many Speech Communication rhetoricians have believed this, and many still do. (I do.)" (100)

rhetoric--and specifically its concept of topoi, transferable topics or lines of reasoning--is useful for reaching across the cultural boundaries of disciplines, as this discussion seeks to do. As Keith points out, animating myths contain "durable sets of perceptions" (99), difficult to dislodge. He admits that "the main practical impediment to [his] understanding English department rhetoricians, and making [him]self understood to them, is the lack of a shared awareness of this animating myth" (100). A myth accounts for occurrences in nature (Hamilton 12); in effect, Keith attempts to account for the very nature of a speech-rhetorician, an inherent, stable characteristic, or something as close to it as might be found. A myth, specifically one that "animates" a group of people and constitutes their common, inherited identity, is endemic to that people; ownership of the myth is profoundly nontransferable.

Topoi, on the other hand, which provide the means of the present inquiry into potential shared understandings between journalists and rhetoricians, are rhetorical constructs, situated in particular contexts and thus changeable. Paradoxically, although situated in contexts, topoi are infinitely transferable, because their applicability is measured against characteristics of a given situation.[18] Aristotle presents rhetorical topoi (plural of topos, place) as lines of reasoning that a rhetor might use to generate either enthymemes or speeches (Rhetoric II.18, 1391b 29 ff.). Topoi may be strategies used in making an

[18] Referred to as loci by Roman rhetoricians and later translated as "commonplaces," topoi have been assigned other uses as well, including mnemonic aids in speechmaking. McKeon provides a brief, informative history of the rhetorical device in "Creativity and the Commonplace."

argument or topics in the current sense. In the context of rhetoric as Aristotle defines it, "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion" (Rhetoric I.2, 1355b 25), topoi are the "places" where those means may be found.[19] Thus, topos is suggestive of a process, i.e., an argument's invention-in-progress.

Aristotle distinguishes specific topoi (idia), applicable to certain situations or particular issues, such as those presented here in discussions of democracy, from common topoi (koina), strategies useful in speechmaking generally. Common topoi he identifies are questions of possibility or impossibility, past fact, future fact, and size or degree (Rhetoric II.19, 1392a 7). Specific or special topoi may also be rather broad, but they are specific to the issue being discussed or the area of expertise within which it falls. They may be related to just about any circumstance of the discourse situation, such as the kind of speech being prepared (deliberative, forensic, or epideictic); the age or disposition of the audience; the kinds of emotional, ethical, or logical appeals the speaker seeks to use; the issue;

[19] Aristotle's use of the word "observing" in defining rhetoric emphasizes the notion that rhetoric is above all a process, further elucidating the idea of rhetoric as technē. "Observing" is translated from the Greek theoresai, meaning "to be a spectator at" (Hill 59). Theorein also means to study; theoria is the study or contemplation of nature. Atwill notes that unlike today's term "theory," theoria suggests more of a "gaze" than an accurate vision; theoria involves "'situated, temporal performance'" rather than "reproduction of a concept or 'idea'" (79). Though rhetoric is always aimed toward an end, i.e., a judgment on a particular issue, observing or studying the potential routes toward that end is what constitutes the technē, or art. Consistent with this idea is Aristotle's comment on successful argument. The function of rhetoric, he explains, "is not simply to succeed in persuading, but rather to discover the means of coming as near such success as the circumstances of each particular case allow" (Rhetoric I. 1, 1355b 8-12).

or subject matter. Aristotle discusses topoi in the context of rhetorical invention, in which they also take on an interpretive or critical function, as a speaker observes the topoi in others' discourse while seeking the makings of enthymemes pertinent to a related or counter-argument. A simple description of topoi that encompasses this dual or dialogic function, is "what we talk about when we talk about X" (Corbett and Eberly 23). As Keith considered stories that speech-rhetoricians tell themselves about their common timeless identity, I consider what rhetoricians and journalists talk about when they talk about the changeable issue of democracy.

Democracy and Publics Theory

Improving public discourse in ways that will better serve democracy is an issue of common concern among some scholars in journalism and rhetoric. The works discussed here give serious consideration to intersections between citizens' and journalists' roles in public opinion formation. These scholars also talk about democracy and its discourses in similar terms and thus offer promise for further meetings of minds across disciplines. The main discussants presented are Rosa A. Eberly, G. Thomas Goodnight, and Gerard A. Hauser in rhetoric; James W. Carey, Theodore L. Glasser, Robert W. McChesney, Davis "Buzz" Merritt, Robert Miraldi, and Jay Rosen in journalism; and Kenneth Cmiel, John Durham Peters, and Michael Schudson in communication.[20]

[20] These disciplinary designations are intended to reflect how scholars identify themselves; i.e., they correspond to departmental or organizational affiliations. I have cast the central issue of this dissertation as locating common ground in journalism and rhetoric, because as I contend above, these subjects comprise a major portion of public-discourse instruction at the undergraduate

Discussion of democratic discourse routinely draws upon topoi raised by Jürgen Habermas in The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, a work that has elicited response from many disciplinary perspectives. The collection of rejoinders edited by Craig Calhoun illustrates the work's diverse appeal; contributors include historians, political philosophers, philosophers, sociologists, and scholars in communication, English, and mass communication. The wide appeal of the work surely relates not only to its eclectic method, a combination of empirical historical research and critical theory, but also to its overarching topoi. Thomas McCarthy notes in an introduction to the English translation that Structural Transformation implies nothing short of the question, "[I]s democracy possible?" (xii)[21] Habermas strongly suggests that it is no longer, in the "post-liberal era" (McCarthy xii). No wonder the work has generated such a wealth of thoughtful commentary, particularly from the hopeful, small-d-democratic quarters of American academe. A discussion of democracy's discourses in late capitalism can hardly proceed without addressing Habermas.[22]

---

level. In research, though, some of the most prominent works on democratic discourse issues come from scholars who identify themselves neither as journalism professors nor as rhetoricians; hence the inclusion here of works in the discipline of communication on journalism and public-sphere issues. The point is not to demarcate disciplinary boundaries but to discover where discussions of journalism and rhetoric now intersect and how those intersections may potentially be expanded as areas of mutual inquiry.

[21] McCarthy thus suggests a common topos (possibility) and a special topos (democracy) found in this work, which may be used to generate further debate.

[22] Structural Transformation was Habermas's earliest book, his post-doctoral thesis, and a subject of controversy from the start, as Calhoun points out (4). Habermas submitted it to Max Horkheimer at Frankfurt, who rejected it,

In Habermas's account, conditions of civil-mercantile exchange under early capitalism fostered the eighteenth-century bourgeois public sphere in Europe, then dissolved under nineteenth-century developments in capitalism that led to competition among private interests for state favor.[23] The bourgeois, or civil, public sphere, located in rational-critical debate among private citizens over shared concerns, became impossible when citizens in the newly commercialized private sphere could no longer present themselves credibly as disinterested discussants of public issues, a necessary criterion in Habermas's model. Mass

---

before succeeding in getting it accepted by Wolfgang Abendroth at Marburg (Calhoun 4). Habermas long intended to revise it, causing its delayed translation into English (Calhoun 5). Nevertheless, upon its appearance in English, as Calhoun remarks, it "remain[ed] extraordinarily suggestive, still the most significant modern work on . . . the historically specific phenomenon of the bourgeois public sphere" that emerged in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe (5).

[23] Among these developments are trusts, cartels, and legislation imposed against them in Germany and the United States in the last quarter of the nineteenth century (143). Habermas describes a confluence of capitalist and government forces that effected a "mutual infiltration of public and private spheres" in this period. Private interests of big business encroached on the bourgeois public sphere, an entity between official-public (government) and private spheres. At the same time, the government intervened in public interests, which the bourgeois public had lost the ability to regulate for itself. Ida M. Tarbell, author of a classic case study in monopoly, A History of the Standard Oil Company, wrote another book that could be read as an account of the US experience of "mutual infiltration" that Habermas describes, albeit absent any explicit discussion of a civil public sphere. The Tariff in Our Times details the development of tariff legislation from the Civil War era to the first decade of the twentieth century. Tarbell uses Congressional debate as well as data from labor and industry to interrogate the legislation's stated purposes and actual effects. Her account makes it clear that despite legislators' initial justification of tariffs by claims of public interest (i.e., clearing war debt), the decision process was fraught from the beginning with compromise that accommodated powerful private interests. Some discussion of this work appears in chapter four.

circulation dailies replaced the "handicraft"-press periodicals that had generated and circulated the public opinion of coffeehouse debates (181). In Habermas's words, "the press . . . became the gate through which privileged private interests invaded the public sphere" (185). Without the rational-critical debate that constituted the public sphere, public opinion disappeared. In its place Habermas finds two general kinds of opinion masquerading as "public" in the twentieth century. One is "nonpublic opinion," which ensues from informal, non-rational discussion of private citizens and includes the opinions expressed in response to polls (245-46); the other is "quasi-public opinion," which is formal, emanating from institutions and circulating among officials and their cohorts (246-47).

Topoi raised by Habermas pertinent to possibilities for democracy and its supporting discourses include political and economic systems, press control, journalists' practices, and the formation and roles of publics, public spheres, and public opinion. Placing these topoi within the two categories of broad concern in public sphere theory that Peter Dahlgren identifies in Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere in the New Media Age reveals distinctions in disciplinary emphasis among the scholars presented here. Dahlgren's category of "institutional configurations," which includes political and social institutions and public forums of all kinds (Dahlgren 9), encompasses the topoi of political and economic systems and press control raised by Habermas. The category of "sense-making processes," which includes "meaning production and circulation" (Dahlgren 9), takes in topoi of journalists' practices and the formation and roles of publics, public spheres, and public opinion. (While publics

and public spheres might in some contexts be considered "institutions," they are viewed by these scholars as centering on discourse and hence as having to do with sense-making.) Institutional configurations receive the most emphasis from journalists (McChesney, Corporate Media and Rich Media; Carey, "Press, Public Opinion"), while journalists also attend to sense-making processes (Glasser, Merritt, Miraldi). Rhetoricians focus on sense-making (Eberly, Citizen Critics; Hauser, Vernacular Voices; Goodnight, "Personal, Technical"). These emphases suggest that the common ground between journalists and rhetoricians may lie more often in the area of sense-making processes. They imply also that the disciplines may benefit from further interaction, to get a better picture of how the entire process of public opinion formation and expression might work under different economic, political, or social systems and institutional arrangements.[24]

Institutional Configurations

Rhetoricians and journalists alike are reluctant to accept the bleak prospects for democracy implied in Habermas's work; those here assembled share a guarded optimism that springs perhaps from understandings of their very disciplines as being rooted in democratic principles. Consistent with a concern for promoting democracy, but posing a challenge in the realm of "possibility," is their support of ideas better suited to a political system based on communitarian

[24] I do not wish to make too much of these disciplinary characterizations; my observations pertain to these particular examples of scholarship having to do with "democracy." I would not argue that the distinctions hold true outside of this general topos, although they may serve a purpose in identifying disciplinary lines of inquiry related to public-sphere theory. While I note that "sense-making" and "rhetorical" can be used synonymously, rhetoric encompasses many areas of inquiry, including the history of educational institutions (see chapter three).

theory (Glasser 243-44) than one based on liberal or libertarian theory, as in the United States.[25] As Fred Siebert, Theodore Peterson, and Wilbur Schramm assert, "the press always takes on the form and coloration of the social and political structures within which it operates" (1). Their essays illustrate the scope of the challenge to communitarian theory, which they do not even mention. Writing in 1956, they present the prevailing political theories throughout civilization's history as authoritarian and libertarian. Authoritarian theory underpins aristocracies as well as nineteenth- and twentieth-century Marxist-communist regimes, while libertarian theory is the purported basis of most other modern political systems (Siebert, et. al 1-6).

Liberal or libertarian theory reflects Enlightenment philosophy, which posits individual fulfillment as an end in itself and society as a means toward that end (Siebert, "Libertarian Theory" 40-41). Siebert recounts the history of libertarian thought as developing in opposition to authoritarian theory enacted under aristocratic rule in Europe ("Authoritarian Theory," "Libertarian Theory"), a history that features in Habermas's account of the rise of the liberal public sphere (1-129). Authoritarian theory is founded upon the ancient idea, shared by Plato and Aristotle, that individuals achieve their greatest fulfillment in society; to be fully human is to live in society with others. Under this theory, social or

[25] As mentioned in note 12, I derive and explicate these political theories as found in the sources discussed here. Further study of political theories served by various rhetorical and journalistic practices would benefit from more thorough and recent scholarship, especially that of Michael Sandel, often cited by public journalists who espouse communitarianism, and John Rawls, often cited as a source of liberal opposition to Sandel.

political community (one and the same in the ancient Greek polis) is an end in which individual fulfillment is inscribed. While Siebert associates authoritarian theory with Plato ("Authoritarian Theory" 12), he does not connect its basic premises with Aristotle, who challenged the political and rhetorical theories of his teacher, Plato. Rather than an oversight, Siebert's omission more likely reflects a centuries-long eclipse of Aristotle's philosophy by that of Plato, in practice as well as accepted thought.

Communitarian theory is Aristotelian.[26] Like authoritarianism, it assumes society is an end that encompasses human fulfillment, but it differs from authoritarianism in its acceptance of community authority (rather than elite authority).[27] This difference turns on Aristotle's challenge to Plato's views of knowledge. The two philosophers agree on the distinction between "opinion" (doxa), or knowledge of contingent truths based on experience, and "knowledge" (epistēmē) of unchanging truths based on scientific study.[28] However, as Janet M. Atwill remarks, Aristotle "confers a legitimacy on doxa that Plato would have abhorred" (140). He places this knowledge, available to all and in some senses

---

[26] Glasser cites Arendt, Dewey, and Habermas, all inspired by Aristotle.

[27] Aristotle's idea of democracy depended on elite opinion, too, as judged by current American standards; see note 30. The identification of Aristotle with democratic political theory is meaningful only in the context in which he lived; that is, Aristotle did not discriminate as Plato did among citizens--as defined by Greek law at the time--to identify a ruling class.

[28] The quotation marks indicate how these terms are translated in English; that the words "opinion" and "knowledge" tend to preserve Plato's view is a legacy of Roman and other translations, as Peters points out ("Historical Tensions" 4-5).

held in common,[29] at the center of human action (praxis) and associates it with the practical wisdom (phronēsis) that guides good government (Atwill 141; Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics VI. 3-5, 1139b12-1140b30). Plato maintains that doxa is too unreliable to serve as the basis of public decision-making and thus philosophers, who alone can ascertain unchanging truths, are best suited to govern (Atwill 136-37; Republic V, 476a-VI, 484c). Plato also dismisses the validity of common judgment, arguing that "a multitude" cannot "be philosophic" or ascertain truth (Republic VI, 493e-494a). As Peters notes, "Plato was no democrat" ("Historical Tensions" 4).

The function of the press under liberal theory is to support the free flow of information that helps individuals thrive, enables them to participate in public affairs, and keeps them free of government tyranny. Liberal theory entails the concept of a "free market of ideas" that in turn presupposes a "self-regulating" or "self-righting" principle in which individuals, presumed inherently rational, who

[29] Peters points out that Greeks also used doxa to refer to judgments arrived at in the Assembly ("Historical Tensions" 4; he cites Hans-George Gadamer's Truth and Method). In addition, endoxa refers to current opinion. Translator Martin Ostwald notes, "Aristotle usually examines the beliefs current (endoxa) about a given problem. Such 'current beliefs,' he states in the Topics [I. 1, 100b21-23], are 'the views of all men, or of most men, or of the wise; in the latter case the view may be held by all wise men or by most of them or by the most renowned and respected'" (xx). After considering these opinions, Aristotle draws his conclusions. Ostwald adds that "Aristotle's attitude toward traditional views, both popular and philosophical, is one of great respect" (xx). As support, he quotes the Nicomachean Ethics: "Some of these views are expressed by many people and have come down from antiquity, some by a few men of high prestige, and it is not reasonable to assume that both groups are altogether wrong; the presumption is rather that they are right in at least one or even in most respects" (I. 8, 1098b27-29).

have access to all available information, including diverse opinions, will make the choices that best serve their interests. Under a liberal political system, the press is understood to serve as a check on government, a role to which the descriptions "fourth estate" and "watchdog" refer: the press exists apart from the "three estates" of government, so that it may guard against government abuse of powers held in the name of the people. It is also assigned an educational role, contributing to the enlightenment of the citizenry (Siebert, "Libertarian Theory" 43-57).

Under communitarian theory, the function of the press is to foster free and open debate among citizens (Glasser 241-42; Peters and Cmiel 207-8). The emphasis is on promoting citizens' participation in deciding matters of collective interest, rather than on providing them with the information to act on individual interests. The press that best serves a communitarian system is a "conversation" model, in which it reflects and stimulates discussion in the public sphere (Carey, "Press, Public Opinion" 379-81). Self-regulation is important in this theory, too. However, it occurs in the form of direct participation in public debate or in self-government, as in Periclean democracy, roughly speaking.[30] Aristotle posits a self-righting function within the public practice of rhetoric. He does not assign a moral value to "good" rhetoric, as does Quintilian later with his notion of rhetoric as "the good [person] speaking well," but contends that good rhetors make the

[30] Pericles, who presided over Athens from 461 to 429 BCE, initiated a system in which any citizen could propose legislation before the assembly. He also introduced juries chosen by lot from among the citizenry. Citizenship, however, was limited; women and slaves were excluded (Katula 10).

best possible arguments in advancing competing opinions, so that the audience can judge the best one for the given situation (Rhetoric I. 1, 1355a 28-38) The exercise of reason in public affairs thus occurs in communal debate, rather than in private reflection as in Enlightenment philosophy. Glasser explains communitarian theory in terms of Hannah Arendt's distinction between liberty and freedom, the former being a freedom from constraint on one's individual pursuits and the latter being a freedom to participate in communal life ("Cultivation" 243).[31] "What communication offers politics . . . is nothing less than the credentials for citizenship: the power to act collectively and the sensibility to know when power ends and domination begins" (Glasser, "Cultivation" 246). The role of the press, then, is to help extend those credentials as widely as possible throughout the polity.

Historically both communitarian and liberal theories of the press have proved difficult to carry out in American practice. Scholars disagree on whether the United States experienced its own rise and fall of press-centered discourse. Carey asserts that it did ("Press and Public Opinion," "Mass Media and Democracy," "Press, Public Opinion, and Public Discourse"), while Schudson counters that he finds little evidence of the press having served a function on the order of what Habermas describes in the bourgeois public sphere ("Was There Ever" 152-56). Whether a conversational press failed to occur or failed to survive, the fact of the commercial press looms large in our history. Our media have become more thoroughly privatized and commercial than those in other

[31] He cites Arendt's On Revolution, New York: Viking Press, 1963, 22.

Western democracies.[32] Schudson agrees with Habermas (and Carey), that the modern commercial press embodies a view of journalism that is "the antithesis of association or community" (153).

McChesney concurs, invoking publics theory or communitarianism only implicitly, as "democracy." His economic critique suggests American media fail to serve liberal as well as communitarian ideals. In his view, liberalism and democracy have become conflated, whereas liberalism should be made to serve democracy, "the rule of the many." He argues that liberal freedoms have been appropriated to serve capitalist purposes--providing few constraints on the "rights" to buy, sell, and invest--so that capitalism and democracy are commonly accepted as synonymous (6). The result is a "neoliberal" state, in which citizens retain the right to vote, but a wealthy elite effectively controls the political and economic systems (79). Concentration of media ownership among a few corporations serves to keep this elite in power (110-11). Schudson grants this political-economy perspective some value in "understanding the broad outlines of the news product" ("Sociology" 11) but finds it "a rather blunt instrument for examining a subtle system" that allows for considerable dissent (12). McChesney acknowledges that some good journalism is produced in what he views as a corrupt system, but he contends that the economic elite largely determines which issues will be debated. "Professional journalism is arguably at its worst when the

[32] James Curran points to different configurations of media control in Sweden, the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Poland that he argues better serve democratic discourse by presenting and encouraging a wider range of thought. McChesney offers Canada's system as a successful example of public-service broadcasting (Rich Media 228-40).

US upper class. . . is in agreement on an issue. . . . [and] arguably at its best" when they disagree (McChesney 50-51). Nevertheless, McChesney, perhaps the least optimistic of this group, holds out hope for systemic reforms that would better serve democracy (305-319).

Sense-Making Processes

On topoi related to sense-making processes, scholars in rhetoric and journalism describe similar visions of the formation of publics, public spheres, and public opinion. These visions generally cohere to communitarian ideas that imply a conversation model of the press. Like Habermas, these scholars suggest that news media and literature can play a vital role in publics-formation. However, on the topos of journalism practices that support democracy, their opinions vary. Goodnight points to the need for journalism that encourages public deliberation among citizens. Some scholars of journalism agree with this communitarian-minded end (Glasser, "Communication and Cultivation"; Merritt; Peters and Cmiel; Rosen, Getting the Connections Right). Miraldi aims at dual ends that reflect liberal ideals: inciting officials to action and providing better information to the public at large. An examination of Miraldi's recommendations reveals that they are more supportive of liberalism. However, while his views differ significantly in some ways from those of the communitarians, an examination of these perspectives on sense-making processes begins to show that communitarian and liberal views are not necessarily oppositional within the framework of public sphere theory. Journalistic and rhetorical practices that serve

liberal and communitarian ideals might co-exist and converge in some cases, as shown in the model presented in the next section.

Rhetoric and journalism scholars alike accept the idea that publics are discourse-centered. Publics are treated generally as dynamic, potentially dispersed entities actualized in people's discussion of collective concerns (Carey, "Press, Public Opinion" 383, "Community, Public" 11-12; Glasser 246; Goodnight "Personal, Technical" 216; Hauser, Vernacular Voices 33-34, 60-64, 98; Eberly, Citizen Critics 9-31; Peters, "Historical Tensions" 9, 16, 24; Peters and Cmiel 207).[33] While the rhetoricians in particular criticize Habermas's strict rationality criterion for public-opinion formation, overall these scholars concur with his view that genuine public opinion arises from actual debate among people over shared concerns. Thus, they agree that the aggregated public opinion produced by polling, useful for some purposes, is not a politically efficacious replacement in a democracy for opinion expressed by actually debating publics (Carey, "Press, Public Opinion" 391-92; Eberly, Citizen Critics 26; Hauser, Vernacular Voices 1-3, 6, 190-98; Peters, "Historical Tensions" 18-20).

Rhetoricians take issue with Habermas's indictment of informal reasoning, virtually synonymous with rhetoric, as an invalid means of public-opinion formation (Eberly, Citizen Critics 135; Goodnight, "A Translation"; "Personal, Technical"; Hauser, Vernacular Voices 44-56). Focusing on citizens' deliberations, they offer visions of possibility for democracy, suggesting ways in which democratic discourse can and does occur within, and against, the

[33] Dewey of course advanced this idea (12-13, 143-84, 208), and he is also routinely cited.

constraints of post- or neo-liberalism. Hauser, emphasizing rhetorical conventions that arise from practice, argues that discourse in public spheres achieves effectiveness in its ability to negotiate, not set aside or ignore, the diverse perspectives and interests--the differences--among people who nevertheless share a common desire or need to address a particular issue (Hauser 53-55, 79-80). Eberly also examines this type of flexible, situated public-opinion formation in practice, homing in on topoi as indicators of publics' presence. Goodnight depicts three broad spheres of discourse--personal, technical, and public--characterized primarily by the conventions of argument deemed credible and persuasive by participants ("Personal, Technical"). Each of these rhetorical treatments of publics and public spheres allows for wider citizen participation and points to ways in which journalism may figure in public opinion formation.

Hauser proposes a concept of publics, public spheres, and public opinion that challenges and overcomes problems related to the exclusionary norms and class-based homogeneity of Habermas's model. Incorporating the criticism offered by Nancy Fraser and others on these grounds,[34] Hauser proposes a rhetorical, "reticulate" public sphere: "a discursive space in which individuals and groups associate to discuss matters of mutual interest and, where possible, to reach a common judgment about them. It is the locus of emergence for

[34] Hauser cites Geoff Ely, "Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century," in Calhoun, 289-339. See also in Calhoun: Thomas McCarthy, "Practical Discourse: On the Relation of Morality to Politics," 51-72; Seyla Benhabib, "Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition, and Jürgen Habermas," 73-98; and Peter Uwe Hohendahl, "The Public Sphere: Models and Boundaries," 99-108.

rhetorically salient meanings" (Vernacular Voices 61). Positing a rhetorical basis for a public sphere, Hauser replaces Habermas's exclusionary norm of rationality with that of reasonableness, a norm derived in actual practice by discussants themselves (61). Rather than discounting everyday talk as less valid than formal, rational discourses such as those of the academy, he argues that these "vernacular rhetorics" can be just as effective--or more so--in addressing public issues (60).[35] The reticulate nature of the public sphere accommodates plural publics, forming and dissolving continually, each possibly very diverse. This concept takes into account competing and marginalized groups that Fraser finds missing in Habermas's model, while complementing the rhetorical principles of inclusion and tolerance that Hauser argues are essential to the formation of public opinion (48, 63). Hauser stresses that consensus is not the ideal, but rather the ideal is a process that allows as many people as possible to participate. "[I]n a democracy, consensus is not always possible, nor is consensus the test for whether a public sphere has functioned openly and inclusively in encouraging the judgments that actually do accrue" (63-64). The reticulate public sphere illuminates the contributions of publics whose members are excluded from the forums of mainstream politics' usual suspects.

---

[35] Aristotle, who also characterizes rhetoric in terms of the audience whose judgment is sought, makes a similar point, distinguishing rhetoric from instruction. Unlike a teacher, the rhetor cannot presume the audience's willingness to grapple with the unfamiliar. The rhetor must use "notions possessed by everybody" in attendance, rather than relying on esoteric knowledge, which, while technically correct, may not prove persuasive to those unfamiliar with it (Rhetoric I.1, 1355 a 27-29).

Eberly and Hauser both illustrate how public opinion may be consulted--by scholars like themselves and by other citizens but also potentially by journalists and public officials. They also point to ways in which commercial mass media can both foster and thwart public-opinion formation. Eberly analyzes literary public spheres constituted by responses to four controversial novels over the twentieth century. Her examples offer an implicit and partial refutation of Habermas's view of the commercial press as inimical to public opinion formation. Reading the press for topoi discussed among citizen- as well as expert-critics, she finds evidence of public spheres in active debate in magazines, literary journals, and newspapers over James Joyce's Ulysses (36-61) and in local newspapers over the arrival of Henry Miller's Tropic of Cancer in Chicago (62-103). However, she calls into question the media's role in two other cases, suggesting that it alternately helped to provoke excitement over Bret Easton Ellis's American Psycho (104-32) and to silence response to Andrea Dworkin's Mercy (133-60). Likewise, Hauser indicates that news articles prior to the release of the Meese Commission report on pornography helped shape response, shifting debate to the commission itself (161-88). However, he explicitly accommodates "vernacular exchanges dispersed across media" (74) as potential loci for public opinion, a principle which he illustrates in his reading of public support for candidates in the 1985 presidential election in Greece (85-110). Both of these scholars indicate that publics do form over issues and exert their opinions in alternative forums, sometimes in response to and within commercial media and sometimes despite and outside of them.

Goodnight conceives of a sphere of deliberation or argument as a "branch of activity" characterized by "the grounds upon which arguments are built and the authorities to which arguers appeal" (216); these grounds distinguish private, technical, and public spheres. The private sphere entails informal argument in which people rely upon the materials at hand (218-219). The technical sphere inscribes professional arguments grounded in technical standards of evidence to "advance a special kind of knowledge" (219). The public sphere encompasses arguments that "transcend" private and technical matters, not in the sense of setting them aside, but in discussants' recognition that others outside their private or professional circles are also implicated in a matter. In order to engage a wider constituency, public argument must use less formal conventions than technical argument and draw on more commonly accepted standards of evidence than private argument (219). This in-betweenness, which suggests a kind of Aristotelian Golden Mean that defies extrinsic specification, characterizes argument in the public sphere.

From this perspective, public opinion formation takes place within the public sphere of argument, but issues can move from one sphere to another. Goodnight contends that deliberation on public issues has shifted into technical spheres of "government technocracy or private hands," beyond the reach of citizens' deliberations (225). The problem thus described resembles those raised by Lippmann and Adams, mentioned above; all three suggest a separation of public and technical or expert spheres of communication. However, Lippmann and Adams present the problem in terms of the reliability and accessibility of

information available to the public. (Lippmann's solution resides in more expert representatives of the public interest, Adams' in better education that would allow the Unknown Citizen to decode the messages of Big Persuasion.) Goodnight, in contrast, sees the problem in terms of public accessibility to deliberation. For him, separate spheres are a fact, not a problem; they reflect the way lives are organized. The evacuation of the public sphere is the problem, along with an implied loss of the art of public deliberation. The solution is to transfer discussions of public matters back to the public sphere, and the media are the most obvious means of doing so. However, he finds that journalism in the mass media is largely "committed to technical modes of invention. . . [that] artfully capture the drama of public debate even while systematically stripping public argument of consequences beyond the captured attention given to the media itself" (226). If public issues are to be drawn out of the technical sphere and into the public sphere, journalists themselves need to promote public deliberation through reporting practices that "invite action" (226).

Journalism scholars seek practices that will issue such invitations, to citizens and officials, for action as well as deliberation. Glasser proposes that journalists "cultivate citizenship" by focusing on storytelling that will help build a sense of community among audiences. Peters and Cmiel, also interested in encouraging participatory norms of citizenship, propose an expansion of concerns within the rubric of journalism ethics that would account for journalists' role in publics-formation. Public journalism, as advocated by Rosen, "argues openly for citizens as participants, politics as problem solving, democracy as thoughtful

deliberation" (Getting the Connections Right 16). Merritt describes this kind of journalism in practice in terms of framing issues as shared, public concerns rather than matters that concern officials (123-25). Miraldi proposes a hybrid form of objective and investigative reporting that bends the rules of strict objectivity norms to allow for a more activist role for journalists. These works invoke communitarian theory and its conversation model of the press (Glasser 246, Peters and Cmiel 209-213, Rosen 2-5, Merritt 14-16, Miraldi 153-54), while Miraldi seeks simultaneously to serve liberal ideals (154). All of these perspectives overlap with rhetoricians' ideas about how to encourage wider participation in public debate. Furthermore some look to the literary realm for help in addressing the problems of building publics or stimulating public action.

Glasser claims that storytelling invites a communal response unique among other kinds of communication and thus plays an instrumental role in publics-formation. Stories remind people of their shared realities and awaken them to possibilities for change. "Better than other forms of communication, stories impose order on a disorderly world; they vivify experience by imbuing it with significance and importance" (Glasser 235).[36] Citing Hannah Arendt, he posits stories as the ideal form of communication for inviting citizens to participate in a democratic community (Glasser 235-237; 245-46).[37] Stories build

[36] Glasser does not elaborate on the form(s) over which he recommends the story. For a discussion of "story" versus "information" journalism as they became distinct at the end of the nineteenth century in this country, see Schudson, Discovering the News 88-120.

[37] He cites Arendt's Men in Dark Times, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968, 104, and The Human Condition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958, 186. Hauser provides a detailed example of stories'

communities, Glasser argues, in the sense of literary theorist Edward W. Said's "communities of interpretation" as well as that of the literary public spheres that stimulated political critique in Habermas's account of the bourgeois public sphere (236)[38]--a function that Eberly's work examines in more recent US practice. Glasser is more explicit on the link between publics-formation and communitarian theory than he is on what an emphasis on storytelling would change in current journalism practice, but he notes that storytelling is consistent with Carey's conversation model of journalism.

Peters and Cmiel also turn to literature, in their effort to reorient discussions of media ethics from its narrow emphasis on "media practice" toward a wider vision that includes "ethical reflection." They expand on the conclusion of Glasser and James Ettema that reporters' objective detachment prevents them from adequately addressing moral questions even within the context of their own profession.[39] (Miraldi describes a similar dilemma, discussed below.)

---

constitutive power in his analysis of the Polish Solidarity movement (Vernacular Voices 111-60). The power of the Poles' stories of resistance came from their origin in the public itself. They were the Poles' own stories, arising from and productive of their shared experience; they were not stories told to them by outsiders. Hauser also uses Arendt's Men in Dark Times, to make a point that contradicts Glasser. This work "warn[s] that stories of historians and poets are debilitating modes because they render the audience spectators of the passing scene without the capacity to render judgment" (157). To poets and historians, one might add journalists.

[38] Glasser cites Said's Covering Islam, New York: Pantheon, 1981.

[39] Ettema and Glasser, "Narrative Form and Moral Force: The Realization of Innocence and Guilt Through Investigative Journalism," Journal of Communication 38.3 (Summer 1988), 8-26 and Glasser and Ettema, "Investigative Journalism and the Moral Order," Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 6.1 (March 1989), 1-20.

Journalism, Peters and Cmiel argue, needs to attend to the character-education function that John Stuart Mill proposed for newspapers (205). Mill, known for his commitment to the "marketplace of ideas" theory (a phrase which the authors note he never used), was just as concerned with "how public discussion built the character of individuals" as he was with allowing truth to triumph over error (Peters and Cmiel 204-5).[40] Suggesting, then, that journalists attend to the "forms and forums of talk" that embody public life, they caution against excluding those forms usually considered "expressive" and hence, "literary." All public discourse potentially reveals something about "how a polity talks to and about itself," they assert, drawing, like Glasser, on Habermas, and also invoking Dewey, who proposes that the "art" of news is as important as the sophistication of its inquiry (Peters and Cmiel, 208; see Dewey 183). This eclectic, inclusive impulse resonates with Hauser's and Eberly's location of public opinion in forums Habermas depicts as habitats of "nonpublic" and "quasi-public" opinion: everyday conversation and commercial media. Peters and Cmiel end by pointing journalists toward public sphere theory as a useful resource for discussing the relationship between media practices and public life. The crucial concern of media ethics, indeed politics in general, ought to be "how to construct a public sphere that is democratic vibrant, and free of tyranny" (Peters and Cmiel 213).

Rosen and Merritt also emphasize a conversation model in an effort to elicit citizens' engagement in the forms of discussion and action. Focused on news organizations' practices, public journalism does not address overtly the role

[40] They cite Mill's 1859 On Liberty, David Spitz, ed., New York: Norton, 1975, 21, 57-62.

of literature in this process, although Rosen uses a story metaphor to describe how public journalism differs from other news practices. "Democracy in America, the title of Alexis de Tocqueville's famous work, is the implied subtitle for every serious story a journalist writes," he submits. Public journalists tell a different "story of our common life" than do others. The public journalist's story features "not an audience of spectators nor a class of information-rich consumers, but a nation of citizens with common problems, an inventive spirit, and a rich participatory tradition" (Getting the Connections Right 5). Rosen also describes public journalism as an "argument" about the role of press in a democracy, a set of evolving practices, and a reform movement ("A Case"). The argument of public journalism is that the press should "nourish or create" the kind of deliberative discourse through which citizens can address common concerns ("A Case" np).

Merritt offers practical advice to journalists about how to carry out these ideas. At the same time, he expresses reluctance to do so, appealing to situated, flexible norms like those of Hauser's vernacular rhetoric. "While many tools exist for doing public journalism, . . . it is important at this early point that the tools not be used to define or limit the concept" (121). His suggestions reflect public journalism's intention to draw people into conversation and action, without placing undue constraints on reporters' judgment of what is appropriate to the community and situation being addressed. Like Goodnight, who criticizes news that presents political issues as drama involving unfathomable tragedy with indiscernible causes (226), Merritt exhorts journalists to frame news stories in

terms of community problems with potential solutions, rather than presenting problems as seemingly isolated flaws in systems removed from citizens' purview (124-25).

Merritt's suggestions effectively address Goodnight's concerns, by aiming at news that makes explicit the existing and potential connections among community members affected by particular issues. "Nut grafs," paragraphs that capture the essence of an issue early in a news story, should focus on the shared, public character of a problem rather than on public officials' "antics" (Merritt 123-24). Journalists should provide what is commonly referred to in public journalism literature as "mobilizing information," details such as names, phone numbers, and meeting times that enable people to join in public action or to express opinions on issues (Merritt 126). News stories should identify "stakeholders" in public issues, clarify competing "core values," and show how these people and values are represented in alternative solutions to a problem. Rather than presenting news as a series of isolated incidents that defy public response, journalists should undertake more long-term reporting projects that emphasize the ongoing problem-solving process and seek out success stories (126-27). Merritt also proposes that journalists sponsor public decision-making forums based on models offered by Daniel Yankelovich and James Fishkin (Merritt 109-110). Hauser criticizes both deliberative models as too focused on ideal discourse. Like Habermas, these scholars, while positing public deliberation as the locus of public opinion formation, take it upon themselves to organize and structure the "publics," rather than seeking public opinion in the discourse of

"actually forming publics" in everyday life (Hauser 231). Forums sponsored by public journalists might serve an educational function along the lines of Eberly's proposal that rhetoric classrooms can serve as "protopublic spaces" (Citizen Critics 168-72, "From Writers"). However, Hauser's criticism suggests that public journalists who seek public opinion in such forums are looking in the wrong places.

Miraldi, unlike the others who discuss media practice, does not invoke publics theory, nor is he concerned especially with public opinion. He is, nevertheless, very much concerned with journalists' responsibilities in a democracy. In his examination and explication of contemporary muckraking, he claims to offer a practice that serves both "active" and "passive" citizens (Miraldi 154). His work shows that objective journalism as currently practiced does not serve liberalism let alone communitarianism. Motivated more by the issue of the reporter's involvement in public affairs than that of the citizen, Miraldi asks "whether the journalist should be an observer or participant in the social process" (14). His hybrid objective-activist approach provides an answer. Following Clifford G. Christians, he proposes that journalists should serve the interests of those otherwise without a voice in the political process--people without lobbies, for instance (110).[41] The journalist's role is that of "an inspirational force and catalyst, stirring both the public and the bureaucracy to action" (110). Progressive-Era muckrakers fulfilled this role, he claims, as did their successors

[41] He cites Christians' "Reporting and the Oppressed," in Responsible Journalism, ed. Deni Elliot, Beverly Hills, California: 1986, 110.

who revived muckraking, slightly revised and renamed "investigative reporting," in the 1960s.

"Storytelling" figures in this work as part of the Progressive muckrakers' recipe for success, although Miraldi does not find it the key ingredient that Glasser suggests it is (Miraldi 23-56). Progressive muckrakers were firmly in the storytelling tradition, which Schudson contrasts to an information tradition (Discovering the News 88-120). Like Schudson (Discovering 72-75), Miraldi notes that muckraking coincided with realist impulses in literature, and he describes muckraking as "argument and literature at once" (41). Muckrakers offered "real-life drama" that appealed to middle-class audiences; Miraldi compares the allure of investigative serials to that later evinced by soap operas (44). At the same time, muckrakers adopted elements of the newly developing "ritual" of objectivity (as Gaye Tuchman later defined it), which contributed, along with many other factors, to muckraking's demise (57-80).[42] Still, they were much less constrained than contemporary reporters and freely drew on literary techniques, even fictionalizing occasionally, to hold their readers' interest. Miraldi does not argue for a return to storytelling as much as he argues for the lifting of constraints in general that objectivity imposes on the reporter. Objectivity has its uses, specifically in fact-finding, but new ways must be found to allow reporters more flexibility and to give the audience a wider range of informed opinion" (Miraldi 142).

---

[42] See Tuchman, "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity," American Journal of Sociology 77 (January 1972), 660-670.

John Hess's 1974-75 investigative series for the New York Times on nursing home industry corruption serves as an example of a more flexible objective-activist reporting (Miraldi 123-49). In this case, the reporter negotiated the kind of moral dilemma posed by Glasser and Ettema. After successfully exposing abuses of patients and public funds, Hess, by then extremely knowledgeable on the issue, could not use his expertise to advocate action publicly. Instead, he worked behind the scenes, drawing upon his network of officials, activists, and even a journalist at a competing newspaper, to provoke public response (41-42). Miraldi defends Hess, who acted on his informed judgment of the public good. He finds fault with journalism's objectivity standards, for keeping journalists' opinions from the people whom they could benefit.

To address this dilemma in reporting and its public repercussions, Miraldi offers essentially a rhetoric of objective-activist reporting that incorporates situation-derived norms of reasonableness like those of Hauser's vernacular rhetoric. The reporter ultimately must judge "when to cross the line" from objectivity to activism. Refraining from imposing strict rules on this kind of practice, Miraldi offers a "formula" with four basic steps: 1) use exposé to "inform and outrage the public"; 2) use "persistent, dramatic follow-ups" to "keep the problem on the public agenda", 3) "broaden the inquiry with discussion and analysis of the causes", and 4) "explore remedies and solutions" (110). The overall process is one of "discovery, reaction, discussion, solution" (111; see also

159-60), a process that roughly traces the evolving stases, or states, of argument in classical rhetoric (Murphy 114-15), as discussed in the next section.

The Hess case illustrates the strength and the limitations of Miraldi's proposal. As Miraldi points out, "[t]he exposé function is easily understood and generally accepted" for reporters (160). In this phase, he suggests, reporters should adhere to the usual standards of objectivity in gathering and reporting facts. "However, in the next stage, public discussion, the waters muddy a bit" (160) as they did for Hess. At the point of trying to lead the public through the process of evaluating the exposed issue and deciding what to do about it, the reporter must resort to clandestine manipulation. Hess clearly bent the rules of objectivity, but he did so behind the scenes, maintaining his public image of objectivity. At the same time, he brought an important issue to light and got something done about it. This duplicitous style of reporting is likely to further undermine public trust in journalists, despite the good works it may effect. To the extent that objective-activist reporting succeeds, though, it does so primarily in support of liberal politics, in which public officials are held to their responsibilities by the publicity function of news. This is no small feat, but it comes at a high cost. However, while this approach does not represent the conversation journalism advocated by most of the scholars here, as Miraldi suggests, it may rouse ordinary citizens as well as officials to act on public problems (155).

Summary

In raising the issue of democracy's possibility in the post- or neo-liberal age, Habermas reopened a turn-of-the-century discussion that has engaged scholars in many fields, including journalists and rhetoricians. In discussing topoi related to how publics, public spheres, and public opinion are formed and the media's roles in these processes, scholars themselves provide evidence of a public sphere and the production of public opinion. As this gathering of views illustrates, the fact that they are interested in many of the same issues does not result in consensus on those issues, nor does it presuppose one common end. However, the topoi that form the basis of this gathering, and around which the discussion centers, do suggest potentially compatible ends as well as the makings of further arguments. While there is much agreement here on the discursive nature of publics and public spheres as well as the desirability of encouraging their activation, there is less agreement among these scholars on how to further this goal and how public opinion should serve democracy.

The differences of opinion on these issues suggest topoi upon which to build further arguments. One issue of contention is how journalists can encourage the formation of publics and public opinion. Implied in this issue is what that goal actually entails. Does democracy require publics that act, as Miraldi suggests; publics that speak, as Hauser suggests; the self-aware publics envisioned by public journalists; semi-self-aware publics like those Eberly describes as forming literary public spheres; publics constituted by spontaneous, individual discursive activity as in the case Hauser presents of people writing to

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; or some combination of these concepts? Which of these ends, if any, are compatible, and what kind of democratic theory do they support? Can liberalism and communitarianism be combined, as Miraldi suggests? It is to these questions that I devote the most attention in the next section, in proposing genres of rhetoric and journalism and their functions in forming differing kinds of public opinion within Hauser's model of a reticulate public sphere.

JOURNALISM AND RHETORIC IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE: TOWARD AN INTEGRATIVE MODEL

The reticulate public sphere described by Hauser provides a model in which to consider how journalism and rhetoric can and do conspire among actual publics to form opinion that regulates democracy.[43] The reticulate public sphere encompasses the workings of publics envisioned by other scholars discussed here, which are, as Hauser's model stipulates, issue-centered (64): the private, technical and public deliberations described by Goodnight; the literary publics examined by Eberly; the publics that form around community-centered issues, envisioned by public journalism advocates; and the official or pseudo-official publics moved by Miraldi's objective-activist journalism. The opinions formed by these publics can function in ways that Fraser associates with "strong" and "weak" publics (132-36). Strong publics form opinions that direct action, as in

[43] Omitted from this consideration is the possibility of "public opinion" as an imagined construct or counterfactual norm, unmoored from any empirically discernible public but nevertheless a powerful concept that exerts various forms of influence in democratic politics. See Habermas 236-38; Fraser 124-25; Peters, "Historical Tensions" 14-18; Hauser 32-33.

the deliberations of legislative bodies, whereas weak publics form opinions whose democratic function Fraser finds nebulous and worth further inquiry (134-36).[44] Additionally, blurring the line that Habermas draws between civil society and the state affords a consideration of strong publics that are not officially sanctioned by the state as well as other "hybrid forms" that may be used to hold state or other organizational representatives accountable to their constituents (Fraser 135-36).

Strong and weak publics are analogous to the types of judges and judgments that Aristotle uses to distinguish forensic, deliberative, and epideictic genres of rhetoric. The first two genres are associated with the strong publics of legislative bodies and courts, respectively, and the latter with weak publics of engaged spectators. The three genres of rhetoric provide a basis for considering journalism's genres, models, and functions within the context of public-opinion formation. Aristotle's system of rhetoric, viewed as a system of public-opinion formation, allows an extension of Hauser's rhetorical public sphere to consider journalists' rhetorics and how they interact with citizens' rhetorics in support of liberal and communitarian politics.

Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and Public Knowledge

Rhetoric in the logōn technē tradition upon which Aristotle elaborated is essentially an art of forming public judgments on particular issues. Isocrates in the 4th century BCE called the art of discourse "logōn technē" before Plato

[44] Hauser's Vernacular Voices assumes that task, attending in great detail to the nature and function of vernacular rhetoric and public opinion. Both this work and Eberly's Citizen Critics illuminate the workings of what Fraser calls "hybrid forms" of weak and strong publics, as I discuss below.

coined "rhētorikē" (Atwill 6, 126-27).[45] Aristotle adopted the newer term but differed with Plato on the importance of the art and the practical wisdom (phronēsis) that guides its use, as mentioned earlier. The term logōn technē combines logos, speech and reason, with technē, to mean not just "art of discourse," as it commonly translates, but "art of discourse and reason." Isocrates did not separate philosophical reasoning from practical reasoning, as Plato and Aristotle did (Atwill 129-33). Thus, the fact that Isocrates' logōn technē was taught and practiced within the context of public life, as the art with which citizens attended to matters of common concern, makes it more accurately understood as an "art of public discourse and reasoning." Aristotle preserved the association of rhetoric with the use of practical wisdom (phronēsis) in reasoning about contingent truths (doxa) of social-political affairs, while assigning to dialectic the use of philosophical wisdom (sophia) in reasoning about unchanging truths (epistēmē) of the natural world. Thus Aristotle's system also maintains public reasoning as the basis of legitimacy for public decision-making, a tenet of democracy which still holds today in the form of a counterfactual "normative mandate" (Habermas 236).

Rhetoric, as the art of making public judgments, also encompasses the formation and use of public opinion in a more general sense. The end of rhetoric

---

[45] Atwill cites two authors on this distinction: Thomas Cole, The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991, 98-99, and Edward Schiappa, "Did Plato Coin Rhētorikē?" American Journal of Philology III (1990), 460-73. She argues against their acceptance of Plato's devaluation of rhetoric and the forms of knowledge and education with which it was associated (127-149).

is krisis or judgment; the realm of knowledge within which rhetoric is used and to which it contributes is doxa, translated as opinion, contingent truths, or common understanding, as mentioned above. Krisis can be thought of as "opinion" in the sense of an opinion rendered through rhetoric's practice in a given instance. An accumulation of these judgments or opinions, forming a "pattern of sentiments" on an issue or a group of related issues, becomes "public opinion" (Hauser 96). This idea of public opinion seems to be what Aristotle means by endoxa, translated as "common understanding" relevant to a particular issue, which he says should be consulted in any public deliberation. Describing the inductive process of reasoning about a public issue, Aristotle proposes starting with "what is known to us" about the issue and selecting the most pertinent and convincing opinions to use in one's argument (Nicomachean Ethics I. 4, 1095b 1-3; Rhetoric II. 22, 1395b 20- 1396a 4). He illustrates this process throughout the Nicomachean Ethics, surveying the opinions, accessible if not familiar to his audience, advanced by various recognizable people of the past and present. The general body of knowledge he surveys is doxa, whereas the thoughts he finds on the issue at hand are endoxa. Phronēsis is the working familiarity with doxa required to invent plausible, reasonable, moving, and potentially persuasive arguments; this practical wisdom comes with experience in public life.

Further explication of how rhetoric uses and contributes to doxa occurs in Lloyd F. Bitzer's concept of "public knowledge." In "Rhetoric and Public Knowledge," Bitzer offers what I read as a theory of contemporary doxa within the context of latter twentieth-century American political life. While Bitzer's

argument does not account for the formation of opinion by actual publics (Hauser 32), it captures the unique relationship to public life that Aristotle assigns to doxa. Bitzer argues that public knowledge is "a kind of knowledge needful to public life and actually present somewhat to all who dwell in community" and that it is generated by rhetoric in the service of public affairs (68). Public knowledge differs from what can be known privately by individuals, in that the public, constituted by "conceptions, principles, interests, and values" shared among a community of "significantly interdependent" people (68), is the "authorizing ground" (76) of public knowledge. Doxa, or public knowledge, is also then the domain of shared understandings used in public arguments that Goodnight distinguishes from those of private and technical spheres. The use of this knowledge in making public arguments signifies that it is indeed "public" knowledge; to be useful in making arguments about public affairs, such knowledge is precisely "needful" and "present somewhat to all," commonly accessible and understandable. Rather than any preconceived notion of common interests or "the common good," which must remain open to argument in a democracy (Fraser 129; Hauser, Vernacular Voices 79), this common fund of knowledge serves as a basis for public deliberation about indeterminate issues.

Rhetoric of Weak, Strong, and Hybrid Publics

Aristotle's explanation of krisis as rhetoric's immediate end occurs in his distinction among the genres or divisions of the art of rhetoric by their ends, or the kinds of judgments hearers are asked to make. Combining the descriptions of these judgments and their associated genres with Fraser's classifications of weak

and strong publics illuminates connections among rhetoric, public opinion, and the functions of public opinion. Deliberative rhetoric seeks to establish a judgment about "expediency or harmfulness" of a proposal; forensic rhetoric seeks judgment of "justice or injustice"; epideictic seeks judgment of praise- or blame-worthiness (Rhetoric I. 3, 1358b 22-27). The first two, deliberative and forensic, are judgments that direct public action, or judgments of strong publics, whereas epideictic rhetoric is associated with weak publics. Aristotle makes this type of distinction, acknowledging that the "'onlookers'" of epideictic rhetoric "are treated as the judges of it. Broadly speaking, however, the only sort of person who can strictly be called a judge is [one] who decides the issue in some matter of public controversy; that is, in law suits and in political debates, in both of which there are issues to be decided" (Rhetoric II. 18, 1391b 18-20). Aristotle's inclusion of epideictic as a category different from and yet placed alongside judicial and forensic, suggests that it performs an important function in public life even though it does not direct action.

The role of epideictic rhetoric sheds some insight into that of weak public opinion more generally. Epideictic rhetoric and weak public opinion are not synonymous, since weak public opinion can take the form of deliberative or forensic judgments. But I submit that weak public opinion generally serves as epideictic rhetoric by presenting public judgments as to the desirability of certain actions or types of actions. Both exert advisory rather than directive authority. Like epideictic rhetoric, the opinions of weak publics can serve as sanctions for public action. The implication of this observation is that the normative function

of public opinion often attributed to a counterfactual public can be based in actual public judgments, a point illustrated by Eberly's and Hauser's works as discussed below. In a public that is contiguous with state decision-making bodies, as in the Greek polis, epideictic rhetoric has educative, public-building and public-sustaining roles that enable it to serve as the basis of authorization for binding judgments arrived at through deliberative and forensic rhetoric. These roles can be served (but are not always) by weak public opinion in the reticulate public sphere. The opinions rendered by weak publics can help form strong publics (self-governing non-state organizations). Weak-public opinion can also exert authority in strong publics that represent them (as in courts or legislatures), or in other publics of any type with which they overlap or interact in the reticulate public sphere. An explication of epideictic rhetoric, followed by illustrations will help explain these possibilities.

In Aristotle's system, epideictic rhetoric fosters understanding that facilitates the practice of the other two genres, suggesting the transportability of epideictic rhetoric--and weak public opinion--into arguments that produce binding decisions. Epideictic rhetoric contributes substantially to the shared values that guide the conduct of public affairs by providing a forum in which a public participates in judging praiseworthy actions (Hauser "Aristotle on Epideictic"). Aristotle defends epideictic against his contemporaries' claims that it is primarily an oratory of display. He "enhances [its] role . . . by assigning its practitioners the responsibility for telling the story of lived virtue" (Hauser, "Aristotle on Epideictic"14). As Hauser reminds us, this virtue was an excellence realized in

public life, not a quality inherent to an individual. Thus epideictic provides a vehicle for the realization of virtue. At the same time it serves a didactic role, educating the public in the exercise of practical wisdom (Hauser, "Aristotle on Epideictic" 14-15). The audience that is persuaded to accept the judgment of praise for a hero's deeds "witnesses" or authorizes "a statement of communal ethos" (Hauser, "Aristotle on Epideictic" 16). Such a means of judging public norms is essential for the successful deployment of the other genres in resolving controversy. Epideictic rhetoric serves the invaluable functions of instructing the public in reasoning about ethics and reminding the audience of values they hold in common, thus helping them to imagine the possibility of addressing issues through rhetoric rather than force.

The educational possibilities of epideictic rhetoric are considerably expanded when weak publics engage in deliberative or forensic rhetoric. While the decisions of weak publics remain advisory rather than directive, their deliberations over what to do about past wrongs or future contingencies can also serve as a proving ground for their rhetorical skills of reasoning and discourse. Weak public opinion can thus stave off the "atrophy" of the art of deliberation that Goodnight worries will result from the shifting of public deliberation to the technical sphere (215). This characteristic of weak public opinion responds to a similar concern expressed by John Stuart Mill, who claimed that participation in public debate provided an ethical education for citizens (see Peters and Cmiel 204-5). Eberly's proposal that classrooms be used as protopublic spaces also

invokes the educational value of participating in non-binding public rhetoric ("From Audiences"; Citizen Critics 168-72).

Hauser and Eberly present examples in which publics formed through people's use of epideictic rhetoric; the judgments that emerged served as authorization for subsequent public actions. The Polish Solidarity movement analyzed by Hauser in Vernacular Voices illustrates the possibilities of a hybrid public and also the potential for publics to change in status (i.e., weak, strong, and hybrid), with the sustenance of epideictic rhetoric of praise or blame. Hauser identifies a tradition of Polish resistance memorialized in stories that constituted Poles as a public under communist occupation. These stories of heroic resistance maintained a sense of shared identity and purpose among Poles and also instructed them in the type of virtuous action that eventually led them to prevail in the bloodless revolution (Hauser, Vernacular Voices 111-160). The Solidarity movement was a weak public sustained by epideictic rhetoric, which at an opportune moment became a strong, non-state-sanctioned public whose deliberations directed actions that effected official action, i.e., the defeat of communist rule. Eberly's analysis of literary public spheres in Citizen Critics presents weak publics whose non-binding opinions, some in the epideictic genre of praise or blame and some in the deliberative genre, were used in arguments made by the strong publics of the court system. She argues convincingly that public opinion activated in discussions of James Joyce's Ulysses and Henry Miller's Tropic of Cancer had considerable influence on official decisions regarding censorship (41-59; 62-100). Public opinions praising and blaming the

novels' fitness for public consumption led also to calls for action; both the epideictic and deliberative rhetoric of weak publics lent authority to the courts' subsequent decisions.

Journalists' Rhetoric and Public Opinion

Considering journalism as rhetoric affords an understanding of how different models of journalism and genres of news can participate in public opinion formation as just described. None of the works on democratic discourse surveyed here presume that mainstream commercial journalism routinely represents opinions of actual publics. However, while journalism cannot be read as public opinion, it can be read as rhetoric. Journalism of any kind makes arguments, albeit formed by journalists doing their work, not publics debating matters of shared concern like those invoked by the scholars discussed here. As with any other publicly available rhetoric, journalists' arguments can be mined by anyone else for topoi to use in other arguments. In this respect, journalists contribute to a generally accessible fund of knowledge that has the potential to serve as public knowledge.

What distinguishes public knowledge from other commonly available ideas is its use in rhetoric that constitutes a public. This distinction may seem arcane; what does it matter whether the topoi I select in making an argument are considered public or private knowledge? Who cares, and who decides? The distinction matters only in efforts to locate or participate in publics-formation. In private or technical discourse, as Goodnight suggests, the use of public knowledge is not of concern. Those who care and decide about whether some

element of journalistic rhetoric is public knowledge are people who are trying to study or encourage the formation and use of actual-public opinion, like the scholars and practicing journalists discussed here, or people who want to participate in public arguments. Unlike the other scholars discussed above, who find rhetorics centered in active discourse, Bitzer locates publics in their shared knowledge. As Hauser points out, this conception leaves public opinion vulnerable to continued counterfactual status; it does not get us closer to a finding actual public opinion (Vernacular Voices 32). However, Bitzer's stipulation that public knowledge is "needful" to and "authorized" by a public accommodates the plurality of publics in the reticulate public sphere of our age. While Aristotle assumes, accurately or not, that the polis is the public, for us today, linking public knowledge to an actual public is necessary if we are to see and encourage the democratic workings of publics.[46]

In liberal and communitarian theory alike, journalists are expected to cover issues of importance to public life. Whether they do or not is a question central to the inquiry of journalism's relationship to public opinion. The approach used by Hauser and Eberly to identify and analyze evidence of active publics engaged in argument about issues of collective concern locates actual public opinion as defined by public theorists. This approach offers an alternative to that of agenda-setting research on "the public agenda." Agenda-setting research

[46] It is hard to imagine that Aristotle's political theory does not overlook subaltern counterpublics like those Fraser argues must be included in extensions of Habermas's public sphere theory (122-24). Recent excavations of women's influence on ancient Greek rhetorical practice suggest this possibility (e.g., Glenn, Lunsford, Jarratt).

compares the media's news agenda with "the public agenda" as represented by surveys of issues deemed most important by respondents. Agenda-setting studies show that media succeed in influencing the issues people think about and even in some cases what positions they take on those issues (McCombs, Danielian, and Wanta 293-96). Like public-opinion polling, however, agenda-setting research assumes public opinion is an aggregate of individual opinions registered on surveys, an idea rejected by the scholars here as inadequate in representing the opinions of actually existing publics. While agenda-setting research identifies media effects on individuals' news agendas, it does not show the effects of media in generating opinions of actual publics. To do so requires reading public arguments for evidence of active publics, as Hauser argues (Vernacular Voices 190-98), and as he and Eberly both demonstrate in their studies of public spheres.

Agenda-setting research on aggregated individual opinion does support my contention that journalists can participate in forming public opinion, again, to the extent that their ideas are taken up in arguments engaged in by diverse people or groups over matters of concern to them as a public. To facilitate comparison of journalists' and publics' agendas that would test this idea, journalism can be viewed in terms of the rhetorical genres mentioned above. Although agenda-setting research sometimes suggests the media's agenda "determines" as well as "influences" people's assessments of issues' importance (McCombs, Danielian, and Wanta 282), even strongly influential journalistic rhetoric remains epideictic or advisory. Journalists' rhetoric does not result in judgments that direct actions, as do judicial or legislative decisions. At the same time, the advice offered by

journalism appears in the form of judgments typical of all three genres of rhetoric. These genres, based on the types of judgments they ask audiences to make, are further associated with issue-based categories of stases and topoi, as well as with temporal categories.

Applied initially to courtroom argument, rhetorical stasis theory has been adapted to describe the public decision-making process more generally. It serves as a scheme for identifying types of issues that arise in making judgments that direct action. The four stases, patterned after those identified in the late 2nd century BCE by the Greek rhetorician Hermagoras, to whom the theory is credited, are conjecture or fact (What happened?), definition (What do we call it? [e.g., murder or an accident?]), quality or value (Was it blameworthy?), and policy or procedure (What shall we do? How shall we proceed?).[47] Three of these stases correspond to Aristotle's common topoi, as well as with the relative time frames he assigns to each of the three genres. Forensic rhetoric is primarily concerned with establishing what happened in the past, making arguments at the stasis of conjecture and using the common topos "past fact." Deliberative rhetoric addresses future action, with arguments at the stasis of policy, on the topos of "future fact." Epideictic rhetoric makes judgments about the present, with arguments at the stasis of quality, often addressing the topos of size or degree.

[47] The last stasis, according to Hermagoras, is that of "objection" on grounds of courtroom procedure (Murphy 114-15). Aristotle briefly identifies four types of "questions in dispute" that may have served as a pattern for Hermagoras's stases (Murphy 114-15; Rhetoric III. 17, 1417b 22-27). Other versions of the stases appear in rhetorics after Hermagoras, including those of Cicero and Quintilian. Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca offer a different treatment in The New Rhetoric. Corbett and Eberly, following the latter, place the stasis of cause or consequence between definition and value (83-94).

Characterizing a few journalistic genres rhetorically illuminates journalism's potential roles in public argument. Event-centered news makes arguments at the stasis of conjecture or fact, associated with forensic rhetoric; this type of news tries to establish "what happened," in accordance with the formula of the journalist's five W's. Reviews of books, films, or performances present arguments at the stasis of value or quality, associated with epideictic rhetoric. Editorials, whose purpose is to offer opinions, tend to argue at any stasis other than conjecture or fact, since journalism's understanding of opinion is basically "not fact." Editorials often praise or blame public figures' actions, serving as epideictic rhetoric, or they argue for general or specific courses of action on public issues, serving as deliberative rhetoric.

In all of these cases, the overall function of journalistic rhetoric remains primarily advisory or epideictic. Journalism neither reflects nor dictates public opinion or behavior, highlighting the need for attention to actual-public opinion in order to find out which issues really are of concern to the publics that comprise our democracy at any given moment. As agenda-setting research suggests, journalists influence other citizens by persuading them that certain issues are "important." Every item presented by journalists in broadcast or print media makes a basic argument of value or quality to this effect, claiming, "This issue is worth your attention." In addition news may also make claims at other stases, as just described, but for much of the news audience--people who are not invested with the authority to act on the claims--these claims are subsidiary to the claim of value. If an editorial claims that the local school district should adopt a proposed

teacher-certification measure, this argument tries to persuade its non-school-district-official readers to adopt that opinion, since they have no authority to adopt the actual measure. They have citizens' authority to exert influence through letter-writing and other actions, but unless the editorial advocates such actions, it presents a largely advisory argument for the majority of its audience.

In newspaper reporting, the lead or opening of a story establishes its "news value"--in rhetorical terms, it makes a claim at the stasis of value. The lead makes this value claim implicitly, by presenting facts recognized as newsworthy among journalists. Considerable research in journalism has gone into the issue of news selection, from David Manning White's classic gate-keeping study of 1950 and its successors, to sociological studies of professional, organizational, and institutional factors in news production.[48] This research suggests that while journalism appears to advise its audiences about issues that are of public importance, journalists are themselves subject to many influences and pressures that call into question this basic argument of news value. The complexity of factors involved in producing news presents another reason to consult opinions of actual publics in democratic politics. Contrary to Bitzer's argument for the competence of journalists and other rhetors as public representatives, publics speaking for themselves serve as their own best authorities. Works like Hauser's

[48] See the collection of studies edited by Dan Berkowitz, Social Meanings of News, for a sampling of the range of this research. White's study is included, along with updates on his initial gate-keeping model. See also Michael Schudson, "The Sociology of News Production," and James S. Ettema, D. Charles Whitney, with Daniel B. Wackman, "Professional Mass Communicators," in the same volume, for overviews of sociological approaches to news research.

Vernacular Voices and Eberly's Citizen Critics provide examples of how to read publics' opinions in citizens' letters to editors or elected officials, in their participation in demonstrations, and in other venues in which people deliberate together, directly or indirectly, about matters of shared concern.

Rhetoric that Promotes Public Opinion Formation

The questions remain: What kinds of journalism practices might foster publics-formation, and what kinds of publics would they foster? As a contribution toward an answer, this discussion considers and critiques Merritt's public journalism model, which seeks to promote strong publics, and Miraldi's objective-activist model, which aims to promote both weak and strong publics. Based on the rhetorical framework of public opinion presented here, Merritt's approach seems to offer more potential of success in its goals than does Miraldi's. These approaches suggest other possible rhetorical strategies by which journalists could encourage public action or engagement: journalists should pay attention to actual public opinion in their reporting, give citizens more space in news forums to express opinions, and create genres that ethically and effectively blend what journalists now separate as opinion and fact.

Considered within the rhetorical framework of public opinion presented here, Merritt's and Miraldi's approaches, both deliberative, are laudable in their attempts to overcome the restrictions of objective reporting to encourage public engagement. Merritt suggests framing coverage in terms of policy issues associated with deliberative rhetoric, asking, "What shall we do?" Miraldi's formula closely resembles the stases, ending with the policy question of what can

be done, in response to the problem exposed in the fact-finding stage. Merritt's suggestions, which attend to public-building rhetorical strategies, seem to hold more potential for engaging diverse publics. Miraldi's strategies, directed toward people with official or unofficial authority, may have more potential to effect action, although they may also alienate general audiences.

Merritt's public journalism focuses considerable effort on building an issue-centered sense of community among audiences, a necessary foundation of public-formation. Because discourse-centered publics form around issues (Hauser 63), Merritt's emphasis on news that foregrounds the shared, public quality of issues is well-placed. Likewise, identifying "stakeholders" in these issues and in their potential solutions presents an opportunity for people to compare themselves to those in the story, enabling them to recognize that they may be similarly or perhaps quite differently implicated. This type of journalism presents deliberative arguments that serve an advisory function of informing the audience that this news is important specifically to them. In contrast to news that makes a claim about the importance of an event more generally, as judged by newsroom standards of what is important to a counterfactual public, this type of reporting seems to offer greater potential to elicit feelings of public-ness among audience members. The inclusion of mobilizing information further advises audiences that there is something they can do; this strategy is more suggestive of action. Even the community forums that Merritt suggests, while not an effective means of locating active public opinion, can serve an educational function, enabling citizens to participate in weak-public deliberation.

Miraldi's objective-activist model more effectively serves liberal ideas of democracy, using publicity to move representatives to act on behalf of the people. Rather than focusing on public-building, this model begins by "enlighten[ing]" the audience and eliciting "outrage" through exposé and proceeds with "persistent, dramatic follow-ups" (110). Englightenment and outrage are not likely to move people to act in concert with others, without some accompanying suggestions like those proposed by Merritt, about the shared, public quality of the issue. Instead, Miraldi relies on "advocacy groups and reform-minded legislators" to react with public responses that enable the reporter to "keep the problem on the public agenda" long enough to get the desired response from authorities (110). Miraldi's advice could encourage reporting that moves some previously uninvolved citizens to join in the action, but it seems more likely to encourage the kind of reporting that Merritt criticizes as focusing on authorities' "antics" and distancing ordinary citizens (123-24). It also echoes the dramatic presentation that Goodnight criticizes for failing to initiate productive deliberation (226). Miraldi shows that in the right hands, this approach can be effective, from the liberal perspective; Hess's combination of exposé and behind-the-scenes prodding of the right people effected change. The problem from the communitarian standpoint is that publics are not engaged by this reporting. As suggested in the previous section, this approach risks alienating audiences by the deception involved in the journalist's maintenance of an objective façade while secretly serving as an activist. At the same time, Miraldi identifies important steps in public decision-making and their relevance to journalism: find the facts,

define and evaluate what happened, discuss what to do--and keep after the authorities until they act on the public decision. With some refinement to remove the duplicity involved, Miraldi's formula has potential to serve as an effective model of reporting in support of a liberal concept of democracy that could co-exist with communitarian models.

Beyond these efforts, other suggestions for journalism are implied in the rhetorical model of public opinion formation. First, journalists should seek public opinion as it occurs in vernacular rhetoric as illustrated by Hauser. Public journalists advocate using surveys, focus groups, and interviews with citizen-leaders to ascertain issues of importance to the publics they wish to engage. These methods of convening publics can be helpful, but in addition, journalists should find places where citizens already convene to discuss public issues. They may find citizens "meeting" in Internet forums, on radio call-in shows, in alternative media, in organization newsletters, at poetry readings, or in barber shops. Looking for "patterns of sentiment" in actual citizens' discussions of publicly shared issues will yield public opinions that, reflected in reporting, could engage already-existing publics.

Another means of attending to actual publics is to offer space and air-time for citizens to debate issues publicly: news organizations can provide public forums. Letters to the editor presented strong evidence of active publics in Eberly's analysis; expanding editorial sections to include more citizens' letters and opinions could engage more people in the news while also bringing public opinion directly to journalists. This idea further suggests that some strategic holes

may need to be drilled in the traditional "firewall" between editorial and news operations. Some interaction between journalists on both sides might enable the news organization to identify and be more responsive to public opinion.

Finally, as Merritt and Miraldi both suggest, to foster public engagement through their reporting, journalists need to find ways of breaking the restrictions of objectivity while encouraging audiences' trust in their integrity. Rhetorical theory, which combines appeals to the rhetor's character, to the audience's values and emotions, and to the reasonableness of the argument, presents an ethical system of public discourse that is not halted indefinitely at the stasis of fact. Currently mainstream journalism segments its products according to opinion and fact, a dichotomy that not only separates public affairs reporting into separate news and opinion sections but also prevents reporting from moving out of the fact-finding stage. As Miraldi argues, exposé alone too seldom elicits action. And as Merritt and others claim, stories that present public issues as discrete one-problem-a-day matters do little to suggest possibilities for public action. Overcoming one-stasis news reporting could go a long way toward presenting journalists as participants in public discourse.

Conclusion: Monitorial Citizens and Potential Publics

This discussion and integration of rhetoricians' and journalists' concepts of democratic discourse is meant to suggest potential avenues for future collaborative discussions or actions among scholars who seek similar ends of promoting publics and encouraging the use of their opinions to guide public

decision-making. Toward that end, this conclusion offers some final images of publics and engagement.

Publics, many of these works suggest, are less difficult to find and perhaps to encourage than many works on civic life would have us think. Even public journalists are intent on encouraging active engagement that seems out of step with information-age democracy. Rhetoricians like Hauser and Eberly show that public opinion can be formed and consulted in already-existing forums, with or without radical reforms in journalism, and with or without elaborately organized public events to draw people together. Furthermore they show that even the weak publics without authority to act on their decisions can exert considerable influence in public affairs. Publics can form through correspondence with media or with officials, without participants meeting each other except through their published or broadcast arguments. In the case of public opinion expressed through letters to FDR, the participants were not even aware of each other. Hauser's attention to vernacular rhetoric suggests that publics-in-the-making exist virtually anywhere people engage in discussion about issues that connect them to other people they have not met and will not necessarily ever meet.

These works suggest the kind of engagement in public affairs that leads citizens into public discussion is likely to be fairly ordinary. Citizens who are drawn to participate in public discussion and action may appear inattentive, like the "monitorial citizen" that Schudson finds guarding democracy today. Monitorial citizens are like parents at the pool, Schudson says. "They are not gathering information; they are keeping an eye on the scene. They look inactive,

but they are poised for action if action is required" (Good Citizen 311). This image is considerably less active than that conjured by many of the works that seek to invigorate democracy. But it seems well attuned to American life that centers more often on work and family than on other community connections. Despite their image of public detachment, citizens of this country can be and are often moved to engage with one another to enact change. Even more often, they are moved to converse with one another about public issues.

The monitorial citizen, like many elegant concepts, is perhaps deceptively simple. It rests on conditions that require continual maintenance by journalists and rhetoricians, among others (e.g., elected officials and other public servants). Monitorial citizens need the means of monitoring public affairs as well as the means of "jumping in" when they feel compelled to do so. Journalists and rhetoricians each have roles in providing both of these prerequisites. Journalists provide citizens' primary sources of information and opinion on public issues, and they have the resources to provide important forums for citizens' participation, such as call-in programs or pages featuring readers' letters and op-eds. Rhetoricians provide instruction in skills necessary to monitor and to participate effectively in public arguments. If journalists and rhetoricians continue to do their work with a greater awareness of and emphasis on their potential to encourage citizens' engagement and the formation of publics, they can improve their effectiveness in these endeavors.[49] The interconnectedness of their roles

[49] Pinkleton and Austin, finding a high correlation between media use and citizen efficacy, suggest ways in which news media can improve citizens' engagement. One way is to "[make] the news more clearly relevant" (84), which in turn assumes journalists know what is relevant to their audiences; they can do

suggests that journalists and rhetoricians could also expect to be more effective in preparing citizens for potential participation, if they communicated more often with each other about their work and their potential to collaborate.[50] I suggest a few possibilities for such communication and collaboration in chapter five.

Realizing the potential for such interaction requires concerted, but not necessarily overwhelming, effort on the part of rhetoricians and journalists interested in promoting public participation. In short, if journalists were to attend to the weak publics in our midst to encourage monitorial levels of public engagement, they would be fostering publics-formation. If professors of rhetoric and journalism taught the rhetorical skills of participating in public deliberation and consulting public opinion, there might be more monitorial citizens and potential publics among us each year. If practitioners in the two fields made a greater effort to find ways to cooperate toward their shared goes, they could surely enhance their own effectiveness as well as that of the publics they seek to serve.

---

so by reading actual public opinion in various sources as I have sketched rather than looking to other journalists, public officials, or public relations sources for cues. Pinkleton and Austin also suggest that journalists provide more "opportunities for interactivity among individuals, the media, and public officials," by hosting forums that invite citizens' participation (84-85).

[50] It would seem reasonable that people trained in reading, critiquing, and making arguments would feel a greater sense of political efficacy, though this factor is rarely if ever mentioned in studies of citizen engagement such as those consulted by Pinkleton and Austin. Research that investigates the impact of media use and of rhetorical training on the potential public participation--and the relationships between these factors--could certainly be of use to both fields.

Chapter 2: The Uneasy Alliance of Journalism and Rhetoric under Fred Newton Scott

INTRODUCTION: A UNIQUELY INSTRUCTIVE HISTORICAL CASE

For twenty-seven years (academic years 1903-04 through 1929-30), the University of Michigan had a Department of Rhetoric, an independent academic unit devoted to the study and teaching of written rhetoric at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Scholars in composition-rhetoric have remarked upon the singularity of this department, and of Fred Newton Scott, the rhetorician who chaired it.[1] Some have also noted Scott's pioneering work in journalism instruction. For instance, Scott taught what may have been the first college news-writing course in this country, and he developed a curriculum within rhetoric to train students for professional work in journalism (Stewart and Stewart 115-119; Adams, A History 64-65, Progressive Politics 34).[2] Beyond his leadership in the

[1] See, for example, Adams, A History 24; Berlin 35-36, 46-50; Connors 182-84; Halloran 175; Kitzhaber 69-73, 93-94; Stewart, "Barnyard," "Rediscovering," "Two Model Teachers"; Stewart and Stewart.

[2] Brumm (622) and Stewart and Stewart (3, 12, 16) claim that Scott's course, Rapid Writing, offered in spring of 1891, 1892, and 1893, was the first college course in newswriting in this country. This "first," if indeed true, is of minor historical significance in itself, but it does highlight Scott's position among a small group of pioneers in the field of journalism education. I have found no sources disproving the claim, but college instruction in journalism was certainly not new. Others were experimenting with journalism instruction prior to and simultaneous with Scott's efforts, though apparently not with academic instruction specifically in newswriting. Robert E. Lee's program at Washington College (later Washington and Lee), begun in 1869, consisted of an

National Council of Teachers of English and Modern Language Association, he also helped found the American Association of Teachers of Journalism in 1912 and served as its president from 1917 through 1919 (AEJMC 10, 13; Adams, Progressive Politics, 31; Stewart and Stewart 165).

However, no one has inquired specifically into the relationship between rhetoric and journalism under Scott's purview. Donald C. Stewart and Patricia L. Stewart, in The Life and Legacy of Fred Newton Scott, contribute a thorough account of Scott's academic career, including his work in journalism (see 115-19, 163-66, 199). Katherine H. Adams, in Progressive Politics and the Training of America's Persuaders, considers Scott along with other rhetoricians who developed advanced writing curricula. Here Scott serves as an example of Progressive-Era educators who invested their best efforts in the rhetorical training of elementary-school and upper-level college students--including, among the college students, those taking journalism and creative writing courses (31-35).

---

apprenticeship in a printer's office and had no classroom instruction associated with it (O'Dell 15-17). Sara L. Williams recounts that David McAnally introduced a journalism history course at Missouri in 1879-80, and that English courses there dealt "incidentally" with newswriting beginning in 1891. These courses were not "purely journalistic courses" in her view, though (15). In 1889, proofreading was taught at Temple (O'Dell 50). Newswriting courses were offered in 1893, as part of the Wharton School of Business's five-course program in journalism at the University of Pennsylvania (Sutton 11); in 1892 at the University of Iowa; in 1893 at Indiana University; and in 1894 at the University of Kansas (O'Dell 50). The sources of these dates also show 1895 as the year that journalism instruction began at U of Michigan, though (O'Dell 50, Sutton 39), which calls any claim of "firsts" into serious question, without scouring the catalogs for each school. Catalogs can be wrong or misleading, too. The program at Washington and Lee, for example, was on the books from 1869 until 1878, but apparently no students took advantage of it (O'Dell 15-17).

These works treat Scott's combined curriculum within the contexts of larger projects, providing limited information on how journalism was related, in Scott's view, to other rhetorical areas of investigation and teaching. Neither of them sets out to explain how the two subjects coexisted for so long under Scott's direction.

Nor do these works explore fully the reasons the two subjects were separated at Michigan in 1929, just two years after Scott's retirement,[3] although they provide important contextual insights. They illuminate conflicts over rhetorical pedagogy in general (Adams, Progressive Politics 31-35) and departmental politics at the University of Michigan in particular (Stewart and Stewart 195-206), which had a bearing on the separation of journalism from rhetoric at Michigan. Stewart and Stewart present a convincing case for the motives of power and money in the consolidation of rhetoric and English--especially considering the Avery Hopwood endowment, bequeathed to the rhetoric program for writing awards (204-6). Still, the question remains: Why would professors of English at Michigan take charge of rhetoric but not its allied curriculum in journalism?

Given current disciplinary distinctions between journalism and rhetoric, this question sounds almost absurd. (Why, indeed, would English professors want to take on a professional journalism program?) The seeming impudence of the

[3] The journalism department was formed a year before rhetoric lost its departmental status and became part of English Language and Literature. The journalism move seems to have been made in anticipation of the "consolidation" of rhetoric, linguistics, and literature, which had been under serious discussion since at least 1926. For an account of this discussion and the resulting merger see Stewart and Stewart 193-99 and 203-6.

question bespeaks the exigence of this inquiry into the academic separation of journalism and rhetoric, which, as I have argued in chapter one, are best viewed in a democracy as interrelated arts of public discourse. In this chapter I investigate rhetorically the dissolution of an unusually long alliance between rhetoric and journalism in the department that Scott created and directed. Scott's combination of rhetoric and journalism serves as a case study of the early relationship between the two subjects in higher education. Illuminating the lines of reasoning that supported the separation of rhetoric and journalism at the University of Michigan, this chapter reveals historic tensions between the subjects, which are analyzed in broader context in chapter three. This historical case also reveals the obsolescence of these tensions in light of recent thinking in journalism and rhetoric, supporting the argument begun in chapter one and continued in chapter five for potential interaction between the two subjects today.

A Perplexing Situation

Taken in historical context, the question of why journalism separated from rhetoric at the University of Michigan does not imply a self-evident answer. In Scott's time, influences of the German research university were just being institutionalized in the United States. Departments and curricula were in flux, as they began to align themselves tenuously with various research-oriented disciplines.[4] How departments in academic institutions across the country would

[4] Laurence R. Veysey, in The Emergence of the American University, places the appearance of departments aligned with research subjects in the 1890s, although such departmental organization occurred in the early 1880s in some places (320-22). He also complicates the notion of "German influence" on American universities, showing pronounced changes that German ideas

organize themselves to serve student populations that seemed as if they might grow indefinitely was not at all apparent to Scott's contemporaries. Likewise, the formation of a journalism department separate from rhetoric was not necessarily a foregone conclusion at the University of Michigan. Parallel programs exerted influence across institutions, to be sure. As "programs of study" for professional preparation in journalism first appeared in the University of Michigan catalog of 1909-10,[5] schools and departments of journalism were already underway at other universities. The country's first journalism school opened at the University of Missouri in 1908, and by 1910, the Universities of Wisconsin, New York, and Washington had created journalism departments (Sutton 16). In two letters Scott indicates his awareness of the potential to form not just a department but a school or college of journalism at Ann Arbor.[6]

---

underwent in their transfer to the United States in the nineteenth century and distinguishing among different effects these ideas had on American institutions from one decade to the next (125-133).

[5] A brief 1909-10 catalog section headed "Courses in Journalism," under the Department of Literature, Science, and the Arts, describes two programs. One was a "general course" and the other was aimed at preparing students "for a particular kind of writing, or a special department of the newspaper" (212). The catalog also mentions that those students completing the programs would receive certificates along with their bachelors' degrees. For further information, students were directed to Scott (213). It is unclear how these programs and the special certificate could be in place for academic year 1909-10, while Scott acknowledged in February 1910 that approval from the Board of Regents was still pending (as I discuss in the next paragraph).

[6] In a third letter, Thomas E. Rankin informs Scott, away on leave, that another colleague, John L. Brumm, wishes to form a journalism school (Rankin, Nov. 27, 1923, FNSP). I discuss this letter in the last subsection of this chapter.

The first of these letters is Scott's reply drafted in pencil on the back of a February 28, 1910, letter to him from Charles P. Cushing in New York. Cushing, a writer for the New York World, expressed his disappointment at reading "in yesterday's papers" that a school of journalism at Michigan was seen as "'superfluous'" (by whom he does not say). Cushing comments that he does not understand "why we should train dentists and teach pedagogy" but not give journalism the same consideration.[7] Scott writes that the newspaper was wrong about the school of journalism. He explains: "The project has not been passed upon yet by the Bd. of Regents. As it went through the faculty without a dissenting vote or even debate, I think there's little doubt that the Regents will approve it." Finally he notes, "I do not of course plan to est. a school of j. but simple [sic] a course in preparation for newsp work [no end punctuation]" (FNSP). It is curious that Scott would wait until the final sentence to correct the mistaken assumption that the "project" was a school rather than a course of study within the rhetoric department. It may be that the main issue to Scott was the pending approval of his journalism curriculum; the newspaper's factual error regarding the object of debate was perhaps less important to him (indicated by Scott's "of course" in the last sentence). But it is also possible that Scott did not

[7] By "we," Cushing may mean American higher education in general or the University of Michigan. A dental department or college had existed at Michigan since 1875 (Peckham 79). Wilfred B. Shaw, in his history of the University of Michigan, credits the institution with offering the first "professorship in education" in the United States (Short History 12); Kitzhaber gives the date as 1877 (5), citing Angell's memoir, The Reminiscences of James Burrill Angell (New York: Longmans, Green, 1911, 1912). Michigan did not establish a School of Education, though, until 1921 (Peckham 163).

mind allowing his journalist friend to entertain for just a moment longer--the mere space of two additional sentences--the idea of a journalism school forming at Michigan. Cushing obviously approved of the idea, and Scott probably found it attractive as well.

While I have not uncovered any formal plea from Scott for such a school, a passing remark in another letter, twelve years later, suggests that he supported the creation of one and may have discussed the topic openly. A typed draft to President Marion LeRoy Burton dated May 10, 1924, from Paris, where Scott was on leave, presents hiring recommendations in journalism for the following year. One instructor was resigning, and Professor John L. Brumm, the program's mainstay, had just requested leave. In outlining his criteria for faculty, Scott mentions casually the idea of a journalism "college," as if it were a topic familiar to the president. He advises Burton to consider

> men of powerful and compelling personality, long and successful experience in newspaper work, and teaching ability of a high order, men who would command the confidence of Michigan journalists, and give the College of Journalism, if there is to be one, instant standing and distinction in the newspaper world. (FNSP)[8]

Scott says he has in mind someone like "Paul Scott Mowrer, an old-time managing editor of the Michigan Daily, now in charge of the Paris bureau of the Chicago Daily News, a noted war correspondent, poet, and man of letters."[9] Scott

[8] Stewart and Stewart also quote this portion of this letter. They comment: "Scott's concern, because of his continuous efforts to establish a journalism department to which he had contributed much over nearly thirty years, was legitimate" (178).

[9] Edgar Mowrer, possibly related, was a writer and former student with whom Scott maintained an active correspondence (FNSP; Stewart and Stewart 119).

commends Mowrer's "energy, originality, and organizing ability," adding that he "would be 'heard from' as soon as he appeared upon the campus." These remarks suggest Scott would have liked to see a college of journalism established at Michigan but that he wished to find someone other than himself to direct it, and as he makes clear, he was quite particular about the characteristics the director ought to possess. In closing, Scott states, "I say all this without prejudice to Mr. Brumm, whose many fine qualities I am sure I appreciate." Ostensibly recognizing Brumm's assets, this comment nevertheless implies that Scott did not see him as a candidate to lead a journalism college. Appearing as an afterthought, the remark highlights Scott's failure to make an immediate association between Brumm and the prestige Scott attached to a potential college and its leadership.

Considering Scott's apparent hope for an academic unit, possibly a college, dedicated to journalism, one might ask why the separation between journalism and rhetoric did not occur earlier, rather than why it occurred at all. While answering the latter question will entail an answer to the former, there are other compelling reasons that the latter question remains the more cogent one. The primary reason has to do with this study's present purpose and exigence, as indicated above. To ask why the separation did not occur earlier would reify current assumptions about the distinctions between rhetoric and journalism instruction, whereas this study aims to interrogate those assumptions by examining their history. Three other reasons for this line of inquiry arise directly from historical context, showing that the separation of rhetoric and journalism at Michigan was by no means a clear-cut decision for those involved.

First, Scott's stipulations in the letter to President Burton underscore the point that, in his view, forming a college or department was not simply a matter of standing aside and allowing some kind of administrative evolution to take place. On the contrary, Scott understood that there was nothing easy about creating and sustaining an academic department, let alone a college; at a minimum a successful endeavor required, as he indicated, extraordinary leadership. Having been through these processes with the department of rhetoric to which he had committed nearly 20 years of his career, Scott would have had good reason to be cautious about undertaking a similarly complex venture.[10]

Second, by this time, Scott's rhetoric department was already something of an anomaly,[11] though his reasons for preserving it as long as he did have not

[10] Stewart and Stewart make a similar point about the gravity with which Scott considered a possible journalism school (178), which I quote in note 8 above. Historical articles on the rhetoric and English departments are somewhat misleading about the complexity of forming a new unit, as they lightly pass over the formation of the rhetoric department in 1903. Regarding the separation and reunification of English and rhetoric, Wilbur Ray Humphreys, who taught English, comments, "There were good reasons for their separation in 1903, and even better reasons for bringing them together again in 1930, but the story is too long to be told here" (556). Clarence DeWitt Thorpe, who taught rhetoric, states, "The Department of Rhetoric came into existence as a separate unit--mainly, it is said, because Professor Scott wished it so--in 1903" (560). He adds, "The change occurred with no particular disturbance to courses. Men who had been teaching literature and composition were given their choice of remaining with the old, or entering the new, department" (560). Stewart ("Rediscovering" 541) and Stewart and Stewart (53) are right to question this uncomplicated treatment of a process that would have involved at least some discussion over how courses, faculty, space, and other resources were to be divided.

[11] See Brereton 24. In addition, two pieces of correspondence are informative on this point. In a letter to Scott dated November 26, 1926, Professor Joseph M. Thomas, Scott's former student and longtime correspondent, responds to an apparent request that he succeed his former professor as head of rhetoric at Michigan and that he give his opinion on the proposed consolidation of rhetoric

been fully explored. Had he wished to replicate programs at other universities, he could have transferred the rhetoric curriculum back to the English department and perhaps held on to journalism, though it is hardly conceivable he would have done so. Scott was first and foremost a rhetorician, as Stewart and Stewart point out (199), and it is doubtful he would have thought of giving up the wider field of rhetoric for journalism, which he viewed as one small component of it.[12] At the same time, as the letter to Burton suggests, Scott was reluctant to transfer journalism as a separate academic entity to the care of someone else, including Brumm, the likely candidate, who, under Scott's direction, supervised the

---

and English (FNSP; Stewart and Stewart 198). Thomas, head of an English department at the University of Minnesota that had already taken on public-speaking and composition instruction in 1921, expresses surprise that Scott had not combined the rhetoric and English departments when Isaac Demmon, head of English, retired in 1920. "It seemed to me the natural and logical step to take. I presume it was only your own disinclination that prevented such action," Thomas wrote.

Another letter, from one Michigan English colleague to another, both of whom agitated strenuously for the departmental merger, ridiculed the arrangement Scott wanted to preserve. James O. Campbell (who would become head of the combined departments) wrote on July 11, 1927, to Louis Strauss (then head of English) from a summer visit to the University of Oregon that the faculty there were "superciliously amused at the folly of the divided and separate departments" (DELLP; also qtd. in Stewart and Stewart 198). Stewart and Stewart conclude that Scott's "recalcitrance" in attempting to maintain an independent rhetoric department "was strictly self-preservation" and that he was "marching to the beat of an obsolete drummer" (198).

[12] "The Standard of American Speech" and Other Papers, in which Scott collected what he considered his most important contributions in more than two decades as a scholar, represents the range of the discipline of rhetoric as Scott saw it. Journalism figures hardly at all in this collection; only one paper, "The Undefended Gate," which I discuss in the last section of this chapter, addresses a topic relevant to journalism studies.

journalism program and taught the bulk of its courses from 1918 on. (Brumm did take charge of the journalism department that formed in 1929 after Scott's retirement.) Stewart and Stewart's work shows that Scott's devotion to rhetoric, in all of its facets as he comprehended them, ran deep. He agitated to the very end of his career to maintain rhetoric's departmental status. His colleagues came to see his persistence as stubbornness, an assessment Stewart and Stewart validate (see note 11). The Stewarts also concur with the retrospective judgment, espoused by their own colleagues in the third quarter of the twentieth century, that Scott was too advanced for his era (Kitzhaber 59, 73; Berlin, Writing Instruction 62; Stewart and Stewart 1, 213-14). None of Scott's latter-day admirers considers specifically how journalism may have figured into his allegiance to an increasingly anachronistic rhetoric department.

And that brings us to the third reason to investigate the separation of rhetoric and journalism in Scott's department--a hypothesis for which this chapter will provide further evidence. Scott seems to have believed his vision of journalism instruction would be best realized within a department of rhetoric, where the professional skills of journalism would remain contextualized within--and yoked to--a tradition of rhetoric as a liberal art. Despite the independence of journalism at other universities and perhaps partly because of apparent consequences of that independence, Scott endeavored to preserve journalism's rhetorical roots at Michigan. In short, I surmise that Scott feared for the future of the journalism program that he had created, were it to be separated from rhetoric.

A Significant Tension

Despite his vision of journalism as a branch of rhetoric, however, there is ample evidence that the academic alliance of journalism and rhetoric under Scott's direction was an uneasy one. I argue that this uneasiness between the two subjects primarily stemmed from a tension between the ideas of liberal-arts and vocational curricula, which appears throughout Scott's writings and curriculum and figures in many aspects of the academic milieu in which he operated. It was prominent in the University of Michigan's mission, and it was a frequent topic of debate among American intellectuals at the turn of the century. The pervasive tension between liberal and vocational ideals in and around Scott's work suggests a rhetorical fissure--a line of reasoning by which the division of rhetoric and journalism may have seemed plausible, even logical, to those for whom Scott's program had become a regular feature of the curriculum.

In the remainder of this chapter I elaborate on the troubled relationship between rhetoric and journalism in Scott's work and its possible source in conflicts between liberal and vocational ideas of education. To begin, I present some background on the University of Michigan and higher education in general in Scott's time. This background provides a context for his curricular innovations and shows how the liberal-vocational tension manifested itself in various aspects of life at Michigan and other universities. Then I introduce Scott's views on liberal and vocational education, gleaned from his writings. Examining how these views showed up in the curricula he directed, I argue that liberal-vocational tensions provided likely bases of separation for the two subjects. To conclude, I

suggest possible ramifications of this account for the teaching of rhetoric and journalism beyond Scott's time and place, ideas I explore in wider historical context in chapter three and in relation to current pedagogy in chapter five.

UNIVERSITY LIFE AS SCOTT KNEW IT

The incipience of institutional structures is a key contextual element of Scott's curricular achievements in rhetoric and journalism. Two features of university life in Scott's time are especially pertinent to a consideration of his work. First, university teaching was not yet stratified by research-associated disciplinary divisions we now take for granted. Academic specialties were less narrowly defined. As course offerings grew, new curricular groupings were continually forming and re-combining, some acquiring formal status as departments--as illustrated in the changes shown in English and rhetoric in this chapter. Second, academic life and public life were considerably integrated for many professors. The choice of an academic career did not preclude one's taking an active public role, especially at the University of Michigan, which demonstrated a thorough commitment to the public service mission it had long proclaimed. Such public-minded universities abided, even encouraged, professors' public service; political appointments were common among faculty, as shown in James Burrill Angell's career, discussed below. These characteristics of academic life, related to the developing nature of university structures, inscribed a range of professional prospects for academics of Scott's era, and they are thus important to an understanding of his work. For most of Scott's career, the university and its fields of study were works in progress, under continual

invention and reinvention by professors and administrators, in cooperation with the students and other publics to whom these leaders felt responsible.

Institutional Flux and Innovation

Scott's experience at the University of Michigan spanned four and a half decades of unparalleled transformation for that institution in particular and the institution of American higher education in general. Scott, born in 1860, entered the University of Michigan as an undergraduate in the fall of 1880. Except for the two years from 1885 to 1887 that he spent as a newspaper journalist in Cleveland, he remained at the university until his retirement in 1927. Scott witnessed, worked amid, and contributed to what Laurence R. Veysey calls "the emergence of the American university" in his substantial history of that title. Veysey places this "emergence" between 1865 and 1910 (1-20), distinguishing it as a more gradual phenomenon than the "revolution" that some observers at the time posited (1-2). He characterizes the end of the Civil War through the 1880s as a period of higher-education reform, as a small group of universities formed anew or metamorphosed from existing colleges, with administrators seeking to balance the idealistic desires of founders with popular demands for learning (10-18). By the end of the 1880s, when the vanguard institutions had established a fairly secure place in society, others followed rapidly. Universities saw pronounced structural change from 1890 to 1910, as growth intensified nationally in terms of enrollments and numbers of institutions (Veysey 263-341). The University of Michigan exemplified this national trend (Veysey 268, 330, 339n; Peckham 99-

125), although it continued to change significantly through 1925 (Peckham 155-74).

The fairly close community that Scott entered as a freshman in 1880 was on the verge of becoming larger and more complex by the time he joined the faculty nine years later. In 1880, he was one of 1,534 students enrolled, a figure that already represented nearly a 50 percent increase over the 1,109 enrolled in 1876 (Peckham 91). He studied in the Department of Literature, Science, and the Arts, commonly shortened to the "Literary Department." Academic sub-units, such as "English and Rhetoric" or "Philosophy," also were informally called "departments," with faculty "heads," from "head professors" (not yet called "chairmen"--and further still from the gender-neutral "chairs"). Other academic divisions on a par with the Literary Department were law and medicine departments, a dentistry college, and pharmacy school;[13] the university also had a homeopathic college and a school of mines. Scott received his PhD in 1889, a year prior to the establishment of a graduate department within the Department of Literature, Science and the Arts. In the fall of 1889, he joined the permanent faculty of English and Rhetoric. With enrollment at 2,153 that year, Michigan overtook Harvard as the largest university in the country (Peckham 94).[14] Two

[13] These divisions were equal in that the Board of Regents, which conducted its business by committee, assigned a committee to each of them; the Homeopathic College and School of Mines did not have dedicated committees. The Regents had two other committees, one for finance and one for buildings and grounds (Peckham 90).

[14] Michigan held this distinction two years before Harvard reclaimed it (Peckham 94).

years later, in 1891, Michigan enrollment was 2,692 (Peckham 94), a 75 percent increase from that of Scott's freshman year.

University of Michigan historian Howard Henry Peckham designates 1891 a "watershed" year in the university's development (99), a remark that coincides with Veysey's assessment of national trends. Dividing James Burrill Angell's 38-year presidency into two periods, 1871-1890 and 1891-1909, Peckham characterizes the former as the "personal presidency" (78) and the latter as "the golden years" of growth, change, and, somewhat paradoxically (i.e., less obviously "golden"), a "loss of intimacy" among faculty, students, and administrators (99). Veysey describes the early 1890s as a "boom" period that followed "a basic turning point in the history of the American university," when the newly transformed institutions, after much experimentation, began to enjoy success and stability (264). The popularity of universities, evidenced by steady enrollment increases from 1885 on, began attracting continuous financial support from private and public sources. Veysey concludes that roughly as of the 1890s "[t]he existence of the university was no longer in jeopardy" (264); the academic profession that Scott entered promised a more certain future than ever before at Ann Arbor and elsewhere.

The profession also promised an opportunity to participate in the formation of innovative alliances and organizations in which to advance human knowledge. President Angell embodied this potential for change. Scott entered the university nearly a decade into Angell's term, in a day when the president's influence was a tangible force at Ann Arbor and across the country. Angell

himself enrolled every student in the Literary Department (Peckham 99) even as he led the University of Michigan to a position of national importance. The institution's size alone commanded attention, but in 1887 a Harper's Weekly article also praised its quality of education and respect for students (qtd. in Peckham 95-96). As Angell noted in his 1890 annual report, in his first 20 years as president, the faculty grew from 36 to 103, the budget from $100,000 to $400,00, and course offerings from 57 to 378. New construction included two hospitals, three labs, a museum, a library, and a classroom building (Peckham 96).

The change in character around 1891 to which Peckham alludes reflects a nationwide development of university administrative structures that accompanied burgeoning student and faculty populations. Veysey divides this administrative development into two stages, one in the 1860s and 70s and the second continuing from the early 1890s to the time of his study in 1961 (305, vii). According to Veysey, Angell and his contemporary Charles W. Eliot, who presided at Harvard from 1869 to 1909, "represented a new style of worldly sophistication so far as academic executives were concerned" (305). They led the first stage of administrative growth by attending to budgetary concerns and courting various constituencies, including businesses, to expand their universities' bases of institutional support (Veysey 306).

The second stage of administrative growth featured the creation of bureaucratic systems and staffs to support these executive functions and to manage universities' diverse internal components. By this time the US university housed a modern-day complement of athletics and extracurricular activities in

addition to its courses, majors, and newly developing research programs. Compared to university presidents like Chicago's William R. Harper and Columbia's Nicholas Murray Butler, who ushered in this second stage of administrative growth, "Angell and Eliot in turn seemed old-fashioned almost overnight" (Veysey 306). As Peckham notes, Angell in 1891 "knew all of his 103 faculty, because he had had a hand in appointing all but seven veterans;" by the time he retired in 1909, "mere growth alone [required] a corporate organization, with a nonteaching administration of divided responsibilities" (99). Peckham laments the loss of the "universal man" like Angell to the university president who needed to specialize in "educational administration" and the professor whose research and teaching became increasingly narrow (99-100).[15] Veysey is less nostalgic. Inquiring into possible causes for the rise of bureaucratic structures in academe, he suggests a largely pragmatic one: While bureaucracy was unpopular among academics, it provided a means of control over radically diverse concerns represented within (and beyond) the university (311-317).

Just as Angell came to represent an older administrative style, the University of Michigan was slow to adopt some institutional structures and systems Veysey reports appearing at other universities in the 1890s. Up to his retirement in 1909, Angell clung to the administrative triumvirate of president, secretary, and treasurer, each of whom reported to the Regents' several

[15] The University of Michigan did not get a president of the new managerial stripe until Marion LeRoy Burton's appointment in 1920 (discussed below). Henry B. Hutchins, who took over from Angell in 1909, was a successful president, but he did not exemplify the chief-executive style that Veysey describes as part of the new administrative era.

committees (Peckham 123). Meanwhile at Columbia, Butler inherited in 1902 an organization that included already a staff for himself as well as separate offices and staffs for the bursar and registrar. The University of Michigan did not appoint a registrar until 1925, under President Clarence Cook Little.[16]

Little's predecessor, Marion LeRoy Burton, who took over in 1920 from Angell's successor (Henry B. Hutchins, another old-school administrator), had begun to update the administrative regime with offices and functions that existed elsewhere. Burton fairly represented the new type of administrator. He centralized control in the president's office while encouraging and seeking participation in policy matters from deans, directors, chairs, and professors. A skillful entrepreneur, he initiated an impressive building program and acquired private and public funding for it.[17] Burton also secured a change to the Board of

---

[16] Little also oversaw the creation of a separate journalism department as well as the merger between rhetoric and English. Peckham hints at a move toward business-like efficiency, commenting that the departments merged "because of their common substance" (180).

[17] Veysey remarks that the new breed of president was something of "a gambler, dealing in university 'futures'" (308), a description that may have applied to Burton. Certainly previous presidents had gained considerable support for university ventures; Angell's impressive additions to campus programs and buildings are an example. But Veysey's comment refers to the strategy of deliberately initiating programs in advance of funding and then appealing to supporters for relief. It is unclear how much risk was entailed in Burton's building campaign, but he moved aggressively, and when he died after only five years in office, he had acquired three new buildings and funding for two more, as well as two additions. Burton initiated the first of these projects, estimated at $8,700,000, with $4,800,000 allocated by the legislature in 1921; a second request to the legislature, pending when he became ill, funded the rest. At the same time, private donors initiated three buildings separate from these projects, and athletics revenues funded another (Peckham 156-59).

Regents' organization, whereby committees focused on management and policy areas (e.g., budget, research, students' welfare) rather than on major academic units. This change enabled the president to act more like a chief executive; deans had to communicate with Burton rather than appealing to committees of Regents. Accordingly, he established a weekly meeting with deans and directors and in 1921 requested an assistant to help him with his managerial responsibilities (Peckham 160-61).

Other systems appeared relatively late at Michigan as well. They include the streamlining of bachelor's degrees from several to two in 1901;[18] institution of a letter-grade and point-value system in 1912 (Peckham 132); establishment of a separate graduate school in 1912 (Peckham 129); and a requirement for two years of college before entrance into law school in 1915 and one year before dental school in 1916 (Peckham 132). The university designated its major academic units as colleges (those granting first degrees) or schools (those granting professional degrees) in 1914 (Peckham 123).

If Michigan was slow to adopt changes occurring elsewhere, one could also say that the potential for innovation lingered at Michigan after some of the other major universities had established fairly rigid routines. In its curricula, Michigan faculty continued to experiment and introduce new programs throughout most of Scott's time there. Some arrangements stuck; others did not. For example, a School of Political Science, initiated by Charles Kendall Adams, lasted from 1881 to 1887. The school offered a program of study for juniors and

[18] Peckham notes that Michigan "was following a widespread trend" with this change (112).

seniors, including the country's first college course in forestry. After the school dissolved, its courses were offered through the Literary Department, with which it had remained loosely affiliated (Peckham 86). In 1882, Michigan created a "university system," which allowed third-year students to enter into a combined bachelor's and master's program that enabled them to attain both degrees in two or three more years (Peckham 87).[19] Longer lasting changes included the introduction of music courses in 1880 (Peckham 86) and the establishment of the School of Nursing and Department (later College) of Engineering in 1891 and 1895, respectively (Peckham 102, 104).

Rhetorical Curricula as Indicative of Change

Innovation and expansion conspired to change university structures in this era. From around 1890 to 1920, University of Michigan catalogs map a kind of departmental sprawl: Sub-units crop up like suburbs of cities, some eventually becoming distinct administrative entities. Psychology developed from Philosophy in this way, as did Business Administration and Sociology from Political Economy.[20] Rhetoric and English offer prime examples of the curricular fluctuation and inchoate disciplines characteristic of the University of Michigan in Scott's time there. English at times housed sub-units of Linguistics and Philology

[19] Although this program appeared two years into Scott's studies, he apparently did not pursue it; he received his B.A. in 1884 and his M.A. in 1888, one year after returning to campus following his newspaper work (Stewart and Stewart 12-13).

[20] In 1899, Charles H. Cooley, instructor in political economy, "became assistant professor of sociology and inaugurated that discipline at Michigan" (Peckham 105).

(a pair which for a while decamped to Greek and Latin), Elocution and Oratory, and Rhetoric. Similarly, Journalism developed within Rhetoric, as examined in the next section of this chapter.

The English department that Scott entered as a student bore the stamp of Moses Coit Tyler, an innovator akin to Angell in vision and influence, though in departmental or disciplinary matters rather than those of university administration. Educated at Yale and Columbia, Tyler had been a newspaper and magazine writer as well as lyceum lecturer when Angell hired him in 1867 as Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature (Humphreys 547-8). As English professor Wilbur Ray Humphreys comments in his departmental history, "In his day, [Tyler] practically was the Department of English, and its history was made by him" (548). Notably, Tyler brought a new emphasis on the study of literature to a department then centered on oral and written rhetoric (Humphreys 546). He also challenged the supremacy of British literature in college curricula, encouraging a new appreciation of the United States' own writings. Fred Lewis Pattee, professor and historian of English studies, credits Tyler with teaching the first college course in American literature (qtd. in Graff 211),[21] Tyler devised a unique way of interesting students in the material. Rather than having them read literature to apprehend elements of good writing, he had them read it to discern aspects of the country's social history (Humphreys 548, Graff 211). This approach might be at home in rhetorical studies today (see, for example, Mailloux, Rhetorical Power; Eberly, Citizen Critics), but Tyler's contemporaries

[21] Graff cites Pattee, "The Old Professor of English: An Autopsy," Tradition and Jazz (New York: Century, 1925), 210.

considered it to be history as much as literature (Graff 211). Tyler left Michigan in 1881 for a position at Cornell in history, which he continued to teach through the use of American literature (Graff 211, Humphreys 548-9).

Catalog entries show evidence of further curricular experimentation in rhetorical studies, providing a glimpse of the development of rhetoric's twentieth-century branches, composition and speech, as experienced at the University of Michigan. In 1887-88, the introductory course in rhetoric, previously called "Composition and Elocution," was renamed "Composition and Speeches" (45); in the same year, a new category of courses, "Elocution and Oratory," appears under the listings in English and Rhetoric. "Speech," which later came to distinguish oral from written rhetoric, makes an early appearance here, paired with composition to comprise a course that became "Practical Rhetoric and Composition" in 1890-91 (51). "Practical" signals a distinction that would later emerge between rhetoric and literature as disciplines dealing with production of workaday texts and criticism of artistic ones, respectively. While "rhetoric and composition" courses attended to practice in composing speeches and essays, courses in "elocution" emphasized delivery techniques, and those in "oratory" focused on reading and discussing canonical orations (UM Catalog 1890-91, 54).

Scott, in rhetoric, and Thomas Clarkson Trueblood, in oratory, were parallel innovators in these developments. Trueblood joined the permanent faculty of English and Rhetoric in 1887-88 (two years before Scott did), teaching four courses in elocution and oratory (Kitzhaber 42; UM Catalog 45). After introducing elocution instruction at Michigan, co-authoring a widely used

textbook on the subject (see Cohen 6-8), and heading Elocution and Oratory at Michigan from its formation in 1892 as a department (Kitzhaber 42),[22] he retired in 1926, a year before Scott did. Speech folded back into English when rhetoric did, in 1930 (Peckham 180).[23] As an assistant professor, Trueblood taught a course in 1890-91 listed under "Elocution and Oratory" called "Shakespearian Reading," which entailed "critical study and reading" of Julius Caesar and Much Ado About Nothing (UM Catalog 54). In the same year, Scott, also an assistant professor, taught "Problems in Higher Rhetoric and Literary Criticism," which offered "reading and discussion of the whole or of parts of standard works in rhetoric and literary criticism" (UM Catalog 56). Even these scant descriptions bear traces of what later became more pronounced distinctions between speech-rhetoric and composition-rhetoric. The use of plays in Trueblood's oratory courses increasingly centered on oral readings or interpretations over the years, prefiguring the current performance studies found in departments of speech-communication.[24] His use of "critical study" in an oratory course is an example

[22] The department was renamed "Oratory" in 1906 and "Public Speaking" in 1919 (UM Catalogs).

[23] While Scott's innovations receive ample coverage in Stewart and Stewart, Trueblood's work has received no comparable book-length attention. I offer here a brief look at Trueblood's contribution, by way of sketching curricular changes in rhetoric at Michigan.

[24] Trueblood's teaching of oral interpretation and extensive use of Shakespeare set a lasting precedent at and beyond Michigan, as illustrated by recent tributes to the late Wallace Bacon, a 1947 Michigan PhD and Professor Emeritus of Interpretation at Northwestern University. A biography contributed to the CRTNet listserve (Communication Research and Theory Network) pointed out that Bacon, "a rising star in Shakespeare studies" at Michigan, was recruited by the dean of communication at Northwestern to establish a department of

of rhetorical criticism's beginnings in speech-rhetoric departments, where it remained until recently.[25] Scott's criticism component was called "literary," rather than "rhetorical." These subtle distinctions in course titles and content prefigured later departmental and disciplinary divisions.

Integration of Public and Academic Concerns at the University of Michigan

A factor to consider in Michigan's--and Scott's--relationship to academic trends is who was setting them. Scott and many of his contemporaries at Michigan, as we have seen with Angell, Tyler, and Trueblood, were confident in their ideas and the advances they were making in their arenas of influence. They would just as soon set trends as follow them, and they were particularly skeptical of the suitability of East Coast initiatives to their purposes. Among the elite cadre of academic innovators nationwide to which Scott and his Michigan colleagues belonged, competing principles emerged as points of distinction and contention, often regional. Universities in the Midwest and West cultivated an independent stance in relation to their East Coast counterparts, especially Harvard, Princeton, and Yale (Veysey 98-113). "The East Coast was pictured as standing for books, tradition, and 'culture,' in an effete, undesirable sense," Veysey remarks. "The

---

interpretation, which later became performance studies (Conquergood). Bacon apparently carried to Northwestern the tradition begun by Trueblood at his alma mater; another scholar commented on the profound impression of Bacon's challenging three-quarters course at Northwestern covering Shakespeare's entire canon (Wendt).

[25] Two recent conference presentations addressed the extent to which rhetorical criticism has been and is yet largely a speech-rhetoric concern, although it is making appearances in composition-rhetoric departments (see Leff, "Rhetorical Criticisms" and Mountford).

West, in contrast, meant action, practicality, realism, and progress" (109).[26] Thus Michigan's late adoption of letter grades, for example, can be seen as representing a principled independence from eastern trends. Veysey explains that Wisconsin, Michigan, and Stanford, in a spirit of democracy, refrained for a while from publicizing class standing or assigning grades out of respect for the equality of degrees, whether earned with C's or with A's (63). The University of Michigan did not host a Phi Beta Kappa chapter until 1907 for this reason (Peckham 120; Veysey 63).

In many respects the university as Scott knew it was committed to an ideal of public service. The University of Michigan, as it expanded and changed, adhered to its charter as part of a public education system that encompassed all levels of learning, from elementary through the most advanced.[27] Within this broad purpose of service to the state, the University of Michigan pursued a combination of aims that Veysey describes as distinct to the new American universities: "utility," "research," and "liberal culture." While utility is directly associated with an impulse toward public service, Michigan, like other universities, pursued mixed, sometimes conflicting, aims, as it forged a type of education distinct from the elite-college tradition. Utility itself contained inherent contradictions, apparent in Michigan's case. Conflicting impulses also appear in Scott's similarly public-minded rhetoric and journalism programs, as I suggest

---

[26] Veysey uses "West" here as his nineteenth-century sources often did, to refer to institutions west of the Alleghenies.

[27] On the University of Michigan's origins as the capstone in a territorial system of comprehensive public education, see Shaw, Short History 5-10.

here and discuss in more detail in the next section. Veysey's categories provide a point of departure for analyzing these tensions.

In Veysey's account, the transition from college to university had as much to do with newly articulated aims as it did with new academic and administrative structures; institutions and their aims are inseparable. The aim of "utility" focused on providing "practical public service," to include vocational training; "research" centered on investigative methods based on "what was believed to be the pure German model;" and "liberal culture" was directed toward propagating "standards of cultivated taste" (Veysey 12). In the new American university, these aims, which defined the shape of institutional reforms, gradually superseded the older imperatives of instilling "mental discipline" through a classical curriculum believed to develop "piety and strength of character" (Veysey 9, 21-56). Some institutions became associated with one aim--Harvard and Cornell under Charles W. Eliot and Andrew D. White, respectively, with utility, for example, Johns Hopkins and Clark with research, and Woodrow Wilson's Princeton with liberal culture (Veysey 69, 158, 166, 242-43). However, no institution or even department single-mindedly pursued one aim over the others (Veysey 69). Instead, universities combined aims, leaning toward one or another of them in general or in particular instances. While the three aims easily blur at times, in their opposition to each other they become distinct. These distinctions in turn are useful in analyzing debates in higher education, including those about departmental and disciplinary boundaries. They help identify not only how new

imperatives challenged old ones but also how the new ideas clashed with one another during the era in which Scott worked.

Utility was the first aim to pose a challenge to the older traditions (Veysey 60). Proponents of utility argued for making higher education responsive to the needs of "real life," presumed to exist outside the rarefied campuses of elite colleges. Research followed, spurred by the 1876 founding of Johns Hopkins University, devoted to scientific research on a German-inspired model (124). While research per se is not incompatible with utility, Veysey uses the term to refer to an impulse toward "pure" science or pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, which is distinct from the utilitarian's pursuit of research, or applied science, for the benefit of society at large (121-25).[28] Likewise, liberal culture is distinguishable by the position its advocates took against utility and research. Once the first two aims took hold, proponents of culture waged a vociferous but largely ineffectual campaign to dislodge them as the predominant imperatives of university education (Veysey 180-83). From the liberal-cultural view, vocational education and pure science both threatened humanism, the first with excessive worldliness and the second with too little regard for aesthetic sensibilities.

Arguments for utility tended to favor ideas of "democracy" and "vocation" (Veysey 62)--malleable, ambiguous terms that proved controversial. Educators spoke of democracy in terms of equality among subjects of study; equality of students with regard to social class, race, sex, ethnicity, or even academic

[28] I should point out, as Veysey does (60n), that use of "utilitarian" is not a deliberate allusion to Utilitarian philosophy, such as that of Jeremy Bentham or John Stuart Mill.

standing (as in the positions on grades and class rankings mentioned above); and wide accessibility afforded by lenient admissions or absence of tuition (Veysey 63). Some touted the university as an agent of democratic diffusion of knowledge or culture, in a "trickle-down" fashion (Veysey 64). Reformers in the 1890s took issue with the paternalism of the trickle-down theory of ideas; a Michigan professor claimed that the university ought to attend to the "wisdom residing in the people" (Veysey 65). Later, campus Progressives introduced the idea of public service as equipping students to agitate for change, whereas earlier arguments, especially those for vocational education, had focused on preparing students to enter the "existing order" (Veysey 73). However, Veysey notes, "[i]n practice, the results of [such outlooks] were seldom as radical as the theory" (65).

Arguments for utility could also converge with those for liberal culture or for pure research, by virtue of shared foundationalist assumptions. A 1901 statement by Benjamin Ide Wheeler, president of the University of California, illustrates such a convergence: "The university is a place that rightfully knows no aristocracy as between studies, . . . between scientific truths, . . . [or] between persons," he claimed. Soon thereafter he added, "All that can make one doctrine nobler than another will be its deeper reach toward a solid foundation in those eternal verities on which the world stands" (qtd. in Veysey 66). The contradictory impulses illustrated in these examples figure in Scott's work, as I show later.

James Burrill Angell: Ambiguity and Contradiction in Utilitarian Aims

Angell, who presided at the University of Michigan for more than half of Scott's time there, demonstrates as well as anyone the complexity, ambiguity, and

contradiction among ideas of higher education that simultaneously might inhabit one institution or one mind in this (or any other) era. As Veysey remarks, "Angell promoted the utilitarian program, but in an increasingly mild and unenergetic fashion" (100). Angell's ideas of public service tended to support the existing political and social order. At times his liberal-culture leanings tempered his advocacy of democratic ideals. Acquaintance with Angell contributes further to an understanding of Scott, who thrived professionally during the president's tenure and seems to have shared many of his perspectives.

In his career, Angell personified a traditional marriage of public and academic life. Like Scott, he had been a professor at his alma mater, Brown University, where he had taught modern languages and literature. Angell had also been a journalist. He left his professorship at Brown to become editor of the Providence Gazette, a position he held for six years. Again, like Scott, Angell returned to academe from journalism, serving as president of the University of Vermont for five years before assuming the same position at the University of Michigan (Peckham 77). During his presidency, he occasionally took leave to perform public service, a common practice among faculty at Michigan. Peckham quotes President Grover Cleveland as saying, "When I was in office and needed help I usually turned to the University of Michigan" (100). Angell served from June 1880 to February 1882 as a special minister to China, appointed by President Rutherford B. Hayes (Peckham 88). For part of 1887 he assisted the Secretary of State on the Fishery Commission in negotiations with the British for fishing rights off Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick (Peckham 93-94). From

June 1897 to August 1898 President William McKinley posted him as minister to Turkey (Peckham 101).

Consistent with this personal commitment to public service, Angell embraced the University of Michigan's responsibility to provide higher education of value to the state. In Peckham's view, Angell "saw the state university as combining some of the practical and popular aspects of the land-grant colleges with the high learning of the private colleges" (96). Hence, under Angell's leadership the university proved hospitable to advances in vocational programs such as engineering, nursing, and business, mentioned above, as well as to Scott's foray into journalism instruction. In fact in his inaugural address, nearly a decade before Scott entered the university as a freshman, Angell advocated a professional course in journalism (Kitzhaber 29).[29]

At the same time, Angell expressed sentiments in keeping with earlier "discipline and piety" aims or with those of liberal culture. In his 1880 President's Report, he expressed a desire to imbue the university experience with a "Christian spirit," for example, and he wrote to a colleague of his wish to attract more students of classics to provide "a desirable leaven among so many Engineers" (both qtd. in Veysey 101). In the following statement, from Environment and Selfhood, published in 1901, Angell defies association with any extreme ideas that liberal-culture or research advocates might attribute to vocational-minded utilitarians:

---

[29] Kitzhaber cites Angell's Selected Addresses (New York: Longmans, Green, 1912), 25-26.

> Let us not despair of our age. With all its temptations to greed and materialism, this generation has deep down in its heart a hungering and thirst after spiritual truth. The souls of thoughtful men cannot be satisfied with the things of this material world. They must in their better hours reach out after something higher and nobler. (qtd in Veysey 101-02)

Veysey finds such "eclectic" blending of aims common among administrators, who needed to appeal to diverse interests in sustaining support for a university, and among faculty attentive to the "concerns of the outside world" (342), a description that would apply to Scott.

Compared to academics who manifested their public-service ideas in activism (Veysey 73-74), Angell, with his Presidential appointments and his appeals to traditional culture, tended to support existing systems of social and political power. He was not a radical democrat. Rather, in the ambiguous blending of academic aims just presented, Veysey finds evidence of a "conservative" idea of democracy (101). Furthermore the following 1871 statement by Angell reveals how his combination of utilititarian and cultural aims posed a limit to democratic freedom of expression in an academic setting:

> No undue restraints should be laid upon the intellectual freedom of the teachers. No man worthy to hold a chair here will work in fetters. In choosing members of the Faculty the greatest care should be taken to secure gifted, earnest, reverent men, whose mental and moral qualities will fit them to prepare their pupils for manly and womanly work in promoting our Christian civilization. But never insist on their pronouncing the shibboleths of sect or party. (qtd. in Veysey 75)

Angell was for democratic freedom--within an assumed, pre-existing code of Christian morality. Adherence to this code of behavior and belief qualified faculty as "worthy" and "reverent." In seeking a chair for history in 1885, Angell explained to his peer at another university that he "should not wish a pessimist or

an agnostic or a man disposed to obtrude criticisms of Christian views of humanity" (qtd. in Veysey 75). In 1887 Angell hired the economist Henry Carter Adams, who had been denied a chair at Cornell because of his activism against monopolistic railroad practices (Peckham 93). First, though, Angell asked Adams "[s]traightforwardly, and completely without tact," in Veysey's judgment, to explain his economic beliefs (75). Veysey describes Adams' dismay at the request, without mentioning that Angell did appoint Adams as a professor. As Angell indicated in his remarks on academic freedom, his notion of civilized, Christian culture allowed for political dissent. But for him the existing culture was an immovable given of university life; democratic debate was fine as long as it respected this culture.

Angell's thoughts on admissions and expanding enrollments illustrate further the tension between liberal culture and utility in his view of public-serving education. In his 1880 President's Report, he expressed a desire to halt further increases in enrollment (Veysey 101), which stood at 1,534 (Peckham 91). Veysey finds this statement "most unusual in utility-minded academic circles" (101). Peckham, however, depicts Angell as characteristically utilitarian: "President Angell argued that education was a necessity, not a luxury for the wealthy, which must be made available to all who could qualify" (96). It seems "all who could qualify" is the crucial phrase. What did it take to "qualify"? Like most administrators of his time, Angell tacitly supported a view of the university-public relationship as more of a trickle-down than bubble-up affair. While some faculty began to argue in the 1890s against all forms of aristocracy, including

intellectual ones, administrators, utilitarians or not, rarely took this stand (Veysey 65). Yet, on the issue of entrance requirements, Angell assumed a position recognized then as liberal. He maintained a system of high school accreditation, begun before his arrival, whereby graduates of accredited schools in Michigan and eventually neighboring states were automatically admitted to the university.[30] This system, which Veysey calls a "bone of contention in the Midwest" (100), posed a marked challenge to the entrance-examination system initiated in the East. Accreditation allowed greater accommodation of local variations in curricula than did a national examination. On the other hand, it presented another way, albeit less dictatorial than standardized examinations, of imposing standards from above.

"Harvardization" of Composition-Rhetoric and of the University of Michigan

Standardized entrance requirements proved especially controversial in composition-rhetoric, with Scott playing a key role in opposing the system initiated by Harvard. In 1874 Adams Sherman Hill introduced at Harvard a written examination on selected works of English literature, as a means of instituting Eliot's emphasis on English and other modern languages rather than the Classics (Brereton 8-9, Kitzhaber 34-36). Other colleges followed suit, eventually agreeing on standard entrance exams based on Uniform Reading Lists, which in turn came to shape high school curricula across the country (Berlin,

[30] The University of Michigan first extended "admission on diploma" to graduates of schools in other states in 1890 (UM Catalog 41).

Rhetoric and Reality 33-35; Kitzhaber 43-47; Brereton 27).[31] Scott criticized the examination and reading list system in two articles published in 1900 and 1901 ("Report," "College Entrance"). In "College Entrance Requirements in English," he advocates an "organic" relationship between the university and the schools, represented by Michigan's accreditation system, over a "feudal" relationship, represented by the examination system of Harvard and others. In 1910 Scott served on a National Education Association committee to address teachers' complaints against the standardized English tests, by this time administered by the College Entrance Examination Board. A year later, at the NEA's request, this committee, consisting of Scott, two other college professors, and two high school teachers, set out to form a national society of English teachers. On December 1-2, 1911, the society convened the first meeting of what became the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), electing Scott as president (Berlin, Rhetoric and Reality 33-35). Thus the NCTE's first issue and defining moment was its opposition to the entrance requirements in English instigated by and associated with Harvard.

This series of events helps explain how Harvard, under Eliot's presidency, managed to be a leader in utilitarian education and in modern English studies in the United States, while also eliciting strident opposition in composition-rhetoric from otherwise seemingly like-minded quarters. The development of composition under Hill's leadership as Boylston Professor of Rhetoric from 1876 to 1904 adds

[31] See also J. N. Hook's history of NCTE, A Long Way Together (Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1979) and Arthur N. Applebee's Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History (Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1974).

to the picture. Hill built an impressive composition program at Harvard, the first in the country to encompass courses from first-year to graduate-level writing (Brereton 8-13). Significantly, the program did not include research in rhetoric or composition (Brereton 10, 22). The composition program flourished during Eliot's era, but after 1910, only the first-year course survived (Brereton 12, 238).[32] Meanwhile, Francis James Child, whom Hill replaced as Boylston Professor, developed a program of literature studies, including graduate research, which Stewart argues was influential in creating a twentieth-century blueprint for English as a research discipline concerned with literature ("Two Model Teachers" 120-21). Harvard's composition program, too, in the Eliot years, "stood out as an example to imitate or avoid" (Brereton 11).

[32] Hill served as Boylston Professor from 1876 to 1904 and died in 1910. Eliot departed as president in 1909. The disappearance of upper-division writing courses at Harvard may have had more to do with Eliot's absence than with Hill's. Le Baron Russell Briggs succeeded Hill in the Boylston chair, from 1904 to 1925. Charles T. Copeland took over from 1925 to 1937. Briggs and Copeland were dedicated to teaching composition and ably carried on the first-year program (Brereton 12-13). Brereton remarks that "in an environment increasingly hostile to writing instruction, Harvard's upper-level writing courses virtually disappeared after 1910" (12). In chapters one, two, and four, Brereton provides evidence of the criticism that Harvard's program elicited across the country. Locally the environment changed dramatically, too, under Eliot's successor, Abbott Lawrence Lowell. Veysey observes, "The movement which placed Lowell in power represented an effort to capture the institution for the cause of liberal culture" (248). Briggs was a prominent ally in this effort, as was Barrett Wendell, his colleague in composition (Veysey 249). Their commitment to "collegiate" education, or teaching, "as opposed to university education," or the research ideal, contributed to the devaluation of composition in the research-discipline-driven university (Brereton 238). However, as Veysey's comments indicate, in their commitment to the collegiate ideal, Briggs and Wendell also joined the liberal-culture movement that helped overturn Eliot's utilitarian reforms at Harvard, including the comprehensive composition curriculum. This line of inquiry suggests a study in itself, beyond the scope of my purpose here.

At Michigan, Scott offered not only a leading alternative to Harvard's first-year composition course but a rhetoric program that came to stand in a class by itself (Brereton 15, 24; Berlin, Rhetoric and Reality 35-36; Stewart, "Two Model Teachers"). Harvard's first-year course focused on conventions of style and correctness in students' prose, with writing assignments based on the modes of discourse (Brereton 11-12, 26-28). Scott at Michigan and rhetoricians at other utility-oriented universities opposed the Harvard approach for its inattention to the social contexts of writing (Berlin, Rhetoric and Reality 46-53, Brereton 15, 237, 241-51). Scott expressed an abiding concern with the social impulses and purposes of rhetoric in the courses he taught and in his textbooks, as well as in his scholarly articles (Berlin, Rhetoric and Reality 46-50, Writing Instruction 77-84; Kitzhaber 71; Stewart, "Rediscovering" 544-47).

Michigan's rhetorical curriculum rivaled Harvard's in its breadth of coverage, with courses at all levels of study, including graduate level. However, whereas the Harvard courses focused on writing instruction, the Michigan courses attended to rhetorical theory as well as writing. The curriculum reflects Scott's commitment to developing rhetoric as a research subject as well as a teaching subject. Scott directed Gertrude Buck's research for the university's first PhD in rhetoric in 1898 (Thorpe 562; J. Campbell). Before the separation of rhetoric from English in 1903, Buck and eleven other students received master's degrees in rhetoric. During the rhetoric department's existence from 1903 to 1930, another 140 students earned master's degrees and 23 earned doctorates in rhetoric

(Thorpe 562).[33] Scott also created and edited a series of nine monographs, Contributions to Rhetorical Theory, all but one written by his graduate students (Stewart and Stewart 44). Although Buck and other students of Scott's joined him in promoting rhetoric as a discipline, their position remained a minority. Brereton notes that no other program in the country offered doctorates in rhetoric at the time (22), and Scott appears to have been alone in seeking rhetoric's "independence from the English department" (24). Scott's program did not create an enduring precedent at Michigan, let alone at other universities.

Donald C. Stewart refers to these events--the rise of English as a critical-literary discipline and the simultaneous devaluation of rhetoric in the academy as a teaching subject--as the "Harvardization of English departments" ("Two Model Teachers"). He takes this term from the mention of "an era of Harvardizing" in a letter of 31 March 1927 from Thomas E. Rankin, acting chair of the rhetoric and journalism department at Michigan, to Scott, in ill health and on leave in Florida ("Two Model Teachers" 128n; FNSP). Stewart finds that Michigan rhetoricians were "very conscious" of Harvardization in English and rhetoric ("Two Model Teachers" 128n). Oscar James Campbell and Holly Hanford, two Harvard PhDs hired in English in 1921, were among the leading agitators for the English-rhetoric merger at Michigan (Stewart and Stewart 193). As Stewart notes, "The dispute over the amalgamation of rhetoric and English was particularly bitter

[33] For comparison, Clarence D. Thorpe, in his history of the rhetoric department, notes that during this latter period the English department awarded 25 PhDs in literature (Thorpe 562). Kitzhaber also cites Thorpe on these figures (72).

between Rankin and Campbell" ("Two Model Teachers" 128n). Stewart and Stewart provide insight into this dispute in a carefully researched account of the merger (193-99).

Rankin's letter suggests, though, that Harvardization extended beyond English and rhetoric; in his view it was a more generalized phenomenon affecting the University of Michigan as a whole. In this letter of three typed, double-spaced pages, Rankin informs Scott of recent events, mainly concerning the efforts of University President Clarence Cook Little, Professor Campbell in English, and others to effect the departmental merger. Rankin begins by commenting on the "atmosphere of the University," quoting an acquaintance who says she "[knows] no one in Ann Arbor who [is] not unhappy at the present time" (1). Rankin remarks sarcastically that Little "has not yet turned the university into a boarding-school, though his plans in the main look that way" (1). Later he describes two candidates, both with Harvard degrees, being considered to replace Trueblood in Public Speaking and Scott in Rhetoric and Journalism (2-3). The Trueblood-replacement candidate, whom Rankin condemns as reportedly a "'great friend' of Campbell's" (2-3), was currently at Wisconsin.[34]

---

[34] Rankin identifies this candidate as "O'Neill of Wisconsin," who was on campus "to judge a debate" (2). Most likely he refers to James Milton O'Neill, head of the Department of Public Speaking at Wisconsin and a leader in the establishment of competitive college debating (Gray 440-41). O'Neill had an A.B. degree from Dartmouth but "did graduate work at Harvard University and the University of Chicago" (Gray 440). He was a founding member and first president of the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking, established in 1914 (Gray 442-43). The prospect in rhetoric was Homer Woodbridge, who, according to Rankin, had a PhD from Harvard and was at Wesleyan in Connecticut at the time (3).

It is in this context that Rankin states, "We are in an era of Harvardizing and Wisconsinizing and Eastern Boarding-schoolizing." The last full paragraph of the letter is instructive on the generalized nature of Rankin's sentiments against academics from Harvard and elsewhere intervening in affairs at the University of Michigan:

> The President is desperately trying to rush along to fruition his many plans for making this another university than it is. If he had had sense enough to take hold of it as it is and develope [sic] it, there would have been here the most distinctive, distinctively good, I think, university in the country. He really had the opportunity, I believe. What we need is able men, and then opportunity in abundance for them. That is enough to make the greatest university in the world. (3)

Rankin and the other rhetoricians were not alone in their distrust of President Little, appointed after Burton's death in 1925. Peckham's chapter title, "President Little Embattled" (177), reflects a mood similar to that conveyed in Rankin's letter. Peckham compares Little to Presidents Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago and Robert G. Sproul of the University of California, who took charge in 1929 and 1930, respectively: All three "had ideas which were opposed not by students or regents, but by the older generation of faculty members" (177). Little supported the "university ideal of faculty research" and the "New England collegiate ideal of a selected student body, character emphasis, small dormitories, and a common curriculum for the first two years" (Peckham 177). In Veysey's terms, he stood for the ideals of pure research and liberal culture, against which the University of Michigan had long posed a formidable opposition.

Rankin's phrase, "Harvardizing and Wisconsinizing and Eastern Boarding school-izing," thus captures a general antagonism likely shared among some Michigan faculty toward influences that threatened aspects of university life they had come to cherish. In Veysey's analysis, the days of significant innovation in American universities were long gone, and a "pattern" of academic and administrative structures had set in. After 1900, the formation of new academic departments and fields of study in universities nationwide dwindled noticeably; the "general . . . permissiveness in this area lasted only for about two decades [1880 to 1900]" (Veysey 321). The University of Michigan, with its relatively old-fashioned leadership up to Burton's presidency, seems to have encouraged longer than other major universities the innovations of professors like Scott, who also paradoxically became old-fashioned in their independence from national trends. Once universities were a national institution, with basic structural patterns in place, Veysey suggests that competition for "money, students, faculty, and prestige" discouraged aberration (340), and academic aims increasingly blended together at most institutions (342-45). Little's importation of research and liberal-culture aims to utilitarian Michigan exemplifies this convergence. Michigan, finally, was indeed being Harvardized and Wisconsinized--standardized to some extent--and Scott's iconoclastic Department of Rhetoric and Journalism did not fit the pattern.

LIBERAL-VOCATIONAL TENSIONS IN SCOTT'S WORK

Had the winds of academic change shifted another way, allowing rhetoric to survive the early 1900s as a discipline and department separate from English in

the American university, Scott's combined program of rhetoric and journalism nevertheless probably would have come apart after he retired. The reason, I submit, is that Scott's vision of rhetoric, inspired by his reading of Plato and oriented toward a foundational understanding of the common good, did not adequately accommodate the mundane, often ephemeral discourses of journalism. At the same time, Scott treated journalism as a rhetorical practice ultimately concerned with public life and created a curriculum for journalists that resembled Isocrates' public-oriented paideia much more than Plato's philosophical ideal of education. Ultimately, Scott failed to reconcile a tension now evident--in far hindsight, with the benefit of recent rhetorical scholarship--between liberal-cultural and vocational elements in his vision of journalism as a component of rhetorical instruction.

Returning to Janet M. Atwill's distinction between humanist and technē traditions of rhetoric, outlined in chapter one, Scott professed a humanist rhetoric, valued for its culture-preserving function as a means of imparting truth understood to be universal, eternal, and foundational. He strove to establish a place for journalism within this humanist tradition of rhetoric, by highlighting journalism's power as a moral influence on society. In doing so, he pursued a conservative, aristocratic idea of democracy in which the function of rhetoric and its allied practice of journalism was to enable an educated elite to disseminate truth to the masses.

The logōn technē tradition, which Atwill locates in works of Protagoras and Isocrates and finds extended by Aristotle, represents an alternative to

humanist rhetoric. Rather than a means of imparting pre-existing truth, rhetoric as technē is understood as an art used to negotiate meaning in a realm of human interaction, in which truth is recognized as contextually responsive and changeable. Rhetoric as technē opens the way for wider public participation: One need not acquire the ultimate truth in order to make a statement worthy of public consideration; one need only acquire a working knowledge of the issues at hand and the technical skill to make an argument that will be accessible to the intended audience--often daunting requirements, to be sure, but far less elusive, and exclusive, than those of the humanist ideal. As I have suggested in chapter one, the technē tradition also affords a view of how journalists and other citizens can participate together in forming public opinion.

Scott's rhetorical scholarship and pedagogy, compared to those of his contemporaries, were refreshingly responsive to social contexts, as noted first by Albert R. Kitzhaber, then later by Donald C. Stewart and James A. Berlin. However, as shown in this chapter and the next, a concern with rhetoric's social or even civic aspects does not necessarily equate to a concern for greater inclusiveness in public affairs. My critique--again drawing from recent rhetorical thought unavailable to Scott and to scholars of his work just mentioned--shows that Scott was neither the social-constructivist thinker nor the radical democrat that Berlin might have had us believe. This criticism of Scott's work is intended to further the efforts of rhetoricians and journalists to encourage wider participation in public affairs, not to condemn Scott for failing to anticipate rhetorical thought of the 1990s. On the contrary, Scott made an admirable

attempt to overcome the division between cultural and vocational aims in education, in order to address a relationship he recognized between rhetoric and journalism as arts of public discourse with powerful impacts on society and politics. However, his integration of rhetoric and journalism illustrates the limitations of his rhetorical theory for promoting more radical democratic politics than he envisioned. Current and future collaborative efforts between the two disciplines can avoid these limitations with theory informed by a technē tradition of rhetoric, as I suggest in chapters one and five, rather than a humanist tradition, as illustrated in Scott's program.

In a 1921 English Journal article, "Poetry in a Commercial Age," Scott indicates his awareness of the conflicts between what Veysey calls utility and liberal-culture aims in higher education. Arguing against the either-or formulation of "vocational training" versus "imaginative training" in college, Scott says the former nourishes the body, the second the spirit, and thus, both are essential to life. "They are coordinate in different spheres, and any system of education which seeks to establish the complete ascendancy of one over the other or to dispense with either, is dangerous and should be put under surveillance," Scott writes (101).[35] His view, then, is that vocational and imaginative--or material and spiritual--elements must be balanced in a modern education, and his combined department of rhetoric and journalism reflected this view.

[35] Given Scott's role in the debates over entrance requirements and related composition issues, I read this statement, which may have been intended as menacing or mischievous in tone, as very likely an allusion to Harvard and Yale. Harvard was the leading proponent of skills-based composition, as I mention above. English professors at Yale shunned composition-rhetoric teaching altogether (see Lounsbury, Phelps).

Scott's attempt to balance these elements in his curricula is evident in his incorporation of journalism vocational instruction in journalism within a humanist program of rhetoric that primarily served liberal-culture aims. The two subjects grew distinct, though, as I will show here, with their own major sequences and faculties. To a large degree, journalism constituted the combined curriculum's connection to public life, while rhetoric, even with Scott's emphasis on its social aspects, became a school subject more like literature, pursued for its academic and literary-critical value.

Examining Scott's work in subsections on his theory, pedagogy, and curriculum, I draw again upon Veysey's characterization of academic aims of utility, liberal culture, and research, often articulated in debates among Scott's contemporaries. Atwill's categories of humanist and technē traditions of rhetoric, associated with Plato and Aristotle, respectively, are also pertinent to the discussion, since Scott explicitly aligned his theory and pedagogy with Plato's ideas of rhetorical education in contrast to those of Aristotle. Indeed, Scott's interpretation of Aristotle seems congruent with Atwill's, even though the two arrive at opposite opinions about the Rhetoric (i.e., Scott rejects Aristotle's concept of rhetoric; Atwill advocates it).[36] In the invention of his curriculum, Scott endeavored to refit ancient ideas of rhetorical education to the aims of higher education current in his own era. Thus, I first explain how these two schema, presented by Atwill and Veysey, are related.

[36] Scott and Atwill both find reasons to disagree, for instance, with Edward M. Cope's interpretations of Aristotle and Plato; see note 43.

Educational Aims and Associated Rhetorical Traditions

The tension between what Veysey calls utilitarian and liberal-culture aims in education is not a recent or even modern development. Similar tensions are found in ancient Greek disputes over rhetorical education, as Atwill shows in contrasting the culture-preserving humanist tradition of rhetoric expressed by Plato and Quintilian and the potentially transformative logōn technē tradition espoused by Protagoras and Isocrates and extended in Aristotle's Rhetoric. As Veysey observes, liberal culture, though newly articulated by American educators in the latter nineteenth century, in some ways "represented a tradition as old as the Greeks" (194). Some proponents of this aim presented arguments reminiscent of Plato. For instance, English Professor Hiram Corson of Cornell saw education as aiming "to induce soul states or conditions, soul attitudes, to attune the inward forces to the idealized forms of nature and of human life produced by art" (qtd. in Veysey 185). Corson's description of character development accords with ideas espoused by the character Socrates in the Phaedrus. Socrates depicts the pursuit of philosophical knowledge as divinely "inspired madness," a state in which the soul "partakes of . . . beauty, wisdom, goodness, and all such qualities" of the gods (Plato, Phaedrus 122-24). To "this Neoplatonic perspective, purely mystical and aesthetic," Americans usually added a moral element that accounted for both "human volition" and the Christian concept of sin, Veysey points out (186). In this way, the liberal-culture aim encompassed the idea that higher education was a

means of moral improvement, or of developing "character," as in the reverent, Christian character that Angell sought in his faculty.[37]

The humanist tradition described by Atwill serves both the liberal-culture and research aims identified by Veysey. Surveying treatises on humanism and the liberal arts and drawing from postmodern critiques of such works, Atwill argues that the purpose of liberal arts education historically has been to "pass on 'culture'"--"to inculcate a set of cultural values through texts and traditions believed to exemplify those values" (1). This description coincides with Veysey's characterization of the liberal-culture aim (180, 184). Atwill adds that the product of such an education is the "normative subject" (1); a liberal arts education in the humanist tradition thus is a "normalizing" social factor (2). Terms that Atwill finds common to descriptions of humanist traditions are "human," "knowledge," and "value." "Human" is assumed to transcend gender, culture, and history (Atwill 9). "Knowledge" is seen as existing apart from individual and social relations, and is depicted either as the "actualization" of what is in the human mind to begin with[38] or as the description of an object or a practice (9). The

[37] Angell refers to character as a quality inherent to an individual, as it is often understood in philosophical or religious contexts. Rhetoric in the technē tradition treats ēthos more often as a discursive construct, i.e., the character of a rhetor as demonstrated in public discourse. The morally inflected Christian notion of character in Veysey's depiction of American Neoplatonic thought is quite similar to the pre-Christian Phaedrus ideal in its basis in knowledge of eternal truth: In one, truth is believed to originate with a single omniscient deity, whereas in the other, it resides among many gods.

[38] This idea appears in Plato's Phaedrus. Socrates describes human beings as inhabited by souls that once lived among the gods, whose minds are nurtured daily by the "eternal verities" (124). Humans can use their reason to contemplate truth, but they cannot know it fully; they can only glimpse it. Philosophers

depiction of knowledge as human actualization is consistent with Veysey's characterization of liberal-culture ideals, while the concept of knowledge as representational is common to the pure-research aim. Finally, Atwill finds that the "value" of humanist knowledge lies in its use as a means of human fulfillment; knowledge is an end in itself (9-10). Veysey sees research and liberal-culture aims converging on this point. While advocates of these aims subscribed to different ideals of knowledge, both camps held that knowledge was its own reward (Veysey 208-12).

Atwill, like Veysey, associates the humanist, liberal-arts tradition of education with Plato; she connects it as well as with Quintilian and to some extent with Cicero (4-5, 30-38). Of these three, Plato, whose ideas greatly influenced Scott, is most pertinent to this study. Atwill cites an instance in which Plato describes the type of paideia, or general learning, later identified with the liberal arts, as an education that "befits a private gentleman," in contrast to a "technical" education undertaken by one seeking to be a "professional" (29).[39] For Plato, attaining philosophical knowledge was the highest human virtue; one could also attain virtue in the political-social arena, but only to the extent that one's political knowledge was philosophical (Atwill 27). Citing Plato's Phaedrus, Atwill notes the "paradoxical relationship to the polis" implied for the philosopher-rhetor in this concept of knowledge and virtue: Apprehending "true political aretē [virtue]"

---

constitute the class of humans nearest to the gods in their capacity for apprehending truth. Socrates describes philosohical perception as "a recollection of those things which our soul once beheld, when it journeyed with God" (125).

[39] Atwill cites Protagoras 312a-b, Loeb edition, translated by W. R. M. Lamb.

entails communication with the gods and a desire to please them, more than a concerted involvement in public life (27).[40] This paradox is important in considering Scott's view of journalism as rhetoric; his curriculum can be examined for the extent to which it led students to shun or embrace public life.

In contrast to the humanist tradition, with its conceptual links to research and liberal culture aims, the technē tradition of rhetoric supports the utilitarian aims in education that Veysey describes, insofar as poiēsis, the productive knowledge entailed in technē, is valued for its use. That is, productive knowledge is not its own end, and in this way, for Aristotle, it differs from theoretical knowledge. In Aristotle's scheme, poiēsis is the kind of knowledge one uses in technē, and the value of technē lies in the doing or making itself.[41] The product of art is not its own end; the end of the thing made lies in the user. This idea is familiar to rhetoricians, who often acknowledge Aristotle's claim that the end of rhetoric is the audience's judgment (not the speech) (Rhetoric I, 3, 1358a 35-1358b 4).

The technē tradition of rhetoric is intimately concerned with the contingent knowledge of human affairs. Specifically it involves acquisition of

---

[40] Atwill cites Phaedrus 273e, in The Collected Dialogues of Plato, ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961).

[41] To illustrate, Aristotle explains that rhetoric's "function is not simply to succeed in persuading, but rather to discover the means of coming as near such success as the circumstances of each particular case allow. In this it resembles all other arts. For example, it is not the function of medicine simply to make a man quite healthy, but to put him as far as may be on the road to health" (Rhetoric I.1, 1355b10-12).

poiēsis, productive knowledge, rather than epistēmē (scientific knowledge), or aretē (virtue), construed as the embodiment of cultural ideals. Among ancient Greek writers preceding Plato,[42] Atwill finds three common elements in the use of "technē" which serve to distinguish it from humanist traditions of liberal arts:

(1) A technē is never a representational body of knowledge.

(2) A technē resists identification with a static, normative subject.

(3) Technē marks a domain of human intervention and invention. (2, 7)

The technē tradition appears in the teachings of Protagoras and Isocrates, both of whom present the art of discourse as a know-how, which a person can adapt to different materials and situations. For the study of Scott's work, what happens to this tradition under Aristotle is significant, since Scott rejects Aristotle's ideas in favor of Plato's.

Aristotle preserves the technē tradition by situating rhetoric within the realm of productive knowledge (Atwill 162-76, 195). At the same time, as Atwill notes, he effectively denies rhetoric some of its previous social and political power by adopting Plato's hierarchy of knowledge, which is tied to social class. "Art is only the midpoint between the experience of particulars and knowledge that is divorced from the senses; indeed, it is the halfway mark between a life driven by basic 'necessity' and a life of leisure" (Atwill 187). Aristotle preserves the technē tradition, but within a Platonic rather than Isocratean philosophical

[42] Atwill contends that "[a]fter Plato's bifurcation of technē into the true and the sham, . . . Aristotle's classification of art in the domain of productive knowledge was one of the last and most serious treatments of technē as a model of knowledge" (6).

system; he thus forfeits much of rhetoric's potential to intervene in the status quo and invent new possibilities for its practitioners (Atwill 164-189). This problem has plagued rhetoric over the centuries, as theorists continued to devalue rhetoric in relation to philosophy (Atwill 190-206). However, Atwill's work makes a compelling argument for reclaiming Aristotle's concept of rhetoric as technē, within postmodern epistemologies that restore its powers of invention and intervention. This possibility was not available to Scott, as I illustrate below and explain further in chapter three.

In arguing for her reading of Aristotle's rhetoric as an art of poiēsis, Atwill debunks the "theory-practice binary" that has accompanied the disparagement of rhetoric in relation to philosophy and science over the centuries. Carefully refuting the influential interpretations of Edward M. Cope, who maintained Aristotle's rhetoric is praxis, and William Grimaldi, who argued it is a theoretical art, Atwill argues that both interpretations imply a theory-practice distinction in their foundationalist assumption that theory "governs" or "reflects" practice (Atwill 196-206).[43] This relationship departs from Aristotle's taxonomy by linking two types of knowledge--praxis and epistēmē--that Aristotle posited as

[43] The works of Cope and Grimaldi appeared a century apart. Atwill cites Grimaldi, William M. A., S. J., Aristotle, "Rhetoric" I: A Commentary (New York: Fordham University Press, 1988), Aristotle, Rhetoric II: A Commentary (New York: Fordham University Press, 1988), and Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's "Rhetoric" (Weisbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1972). She uses Cope, Edward M., An Introduction to Aristotle's "Rhetoric" (London: Macmillan, 1867) and The "Rhetoric" of Aristotle, with a Commentary, Ed. John Sandys, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1877). Cope's work on Aristotle was available to Scott, as evidenced by his use of it in "Rhetoric Redivida." Scott charges Cope with "an almost malicious misinterpretation of Plato" (418n4), citing the same edition of Cope's Introduction, 30-31.

separate (Atwill 192-93). The theory-practice binary also limits rhetoric by presuming a set of immutable principles that underlies the art; it imposes a "nature" on rhetoric (Atwill 193-96). Theorizing about the art of rhetoric is virtually inescapable for rhetoricians, but such theorizing, if grounded in and serving contingent meaning, need not limit rhetoric's power. Atwill, for example, admits that her study "employs the very methodologies of the tradition it critiques." To this problem she offers a solution fairly common in anti-foundationalist rhetoric, suggesting that rhetorical theories be formed and used more heuristically than descriptively (46).[44] This solution provides a point of critique for Scott's work: To what extent was his use of theory heuristic and to what extent descriptive?

The characteristics of a technē are crucial to rhetoric's power in a democracy. Only as a technē, not as a philosophical or scientific subject, can rhetoric be envisioned as empowering its users to intervene in public affairs and invent new political and social realities. To align rhetoric with a body of knowledge, whether practical or theoretical, limits its transferability across situations, the characteristic most important to the art's infinite usefulness.[45]

---

[44] See Berlin for a survey of early work among composition-rhetoricians in the anti-foundational category he calls transactional rhetoric (Rhetoric and Reality 155-79). Berlin notes (161) that Janice Lauer is one rhetorician who argued for the heuristic value of theory as an aid to teachers, in "Heuristics and Composition," College Composition and Communication 21 (1970): 396-404, and "Counterstatement: Response to Ann E. Berthoff," College Composition and Communication 23 (1972): 208-10.

[45] Aristotle suggests as much when he summarizes his discussion of rhetoric's usefulness: "It is clear, then, that rhetoric is not bound up with a single definite class of subjects, but is as universal as dialectic; it is clear, also, that it is useful" (Rhetoric I.1, 1355b8, italics mine). Atwill provides compelling support

Atwill posits rhetoric as the ultimate art of democracy in the radical sense that Veysey finds occasionally invoked but rarely served by educators professing public-service aims. Rhetorical education in the technē tradition develops in students the wherewithal to transform existing social, political, and cultural orders, rather than re-inscribing those orders as the content of education. Scott, though ahead of his time in many other respects, did not envision this radical potential for rhetoric. Invoking Plato, he pursued a conservative, trickle-down or aristocratic idea of democratic education, served by a humanist tradition of rhetoric. He placed journalism within this tradition, conferring upon journalists the public responsibility of preserving moral values, as evidenced in the following examination of his writings and curricula.

Scott's Theory: Journalism as a Branch of Rhetorical Study and Practice

Scott's scholarship indicates that he saw the art of rhetoric as encompassing journalism, along with literary criticism, fiction, and other written and oral genres.[46] He also presents journalism as having a special relationship to rhetoric by virtue of its daily presence, in the newspaper, as an example and de facto teacher of rhetoric. Like other rhetorical arts, journalism deserved advanced

---

for the categorization of rhetoric as productive rather than practical knowledge (192-99, 75-77).

[46] While this study focuses on Scott's conception of written rhetoric, he entertained an equally eclectic concept of oral rhetoric. He considered rhetoric to include casual conversation as well as formal speech-making ("Rhetoric Rediviva" 415). Some of his rhetorical research might now be considered in the area of linguistics, as he addressed social aspects of colloquial speech and dialect (e.g., "The Standard of American Speech," "The Colloquial Nasals," "The Genesis of Speech").

study, he argued, citing reasons that reflect research and liberal-culture aims. Berlin claims that Scott introduced a rhetoric for democracy, but Scott's idea of democracy, like Angell's, was aristocratic in its adherence to foundationalist ideals of knowledge and virtue contained and disseminated through liberal culture. He did not invoke the radical democracy that Atwill seeks to serve and Veysey finds in evidence among some contemporaries of Scott's in other fields. Instead, he strove to elevate the vocation of journalism as a culture-preserving enterprise by securing its place in the university as a liberal art worthy of advanced research. Thus pursuing a blend of liberal culture and research aims, Scott mitigated the interventionist potential of journalism as rhetorical technē. As I suggest here and examine further in chapter three, both the research and liberal-culture aims found in Scott's work signal a humanist perspective toward rhetoric; both aims assume an immutable truth, impervious to rhetorical intervention.

Scott situates journalism within a culture-imparting humanist tradition of rhetoric in "The Undefended Gate," his presidential address to the National Council of Teachers of English in 1913. He relates journalism to rhetoric by assigning the newspaper a special role, one it performs unsatisfactorily in his assessment, in the rhetorical education of youth. Given that the newspaper effectively appeals, through its various sections, to each reading member of the family, Scott proposes "we may at least demand of it the qualities that we should demand of any other daily visitor who might desire admission to the family circle" (122). He would demand that the newspaper be a model of moral character, "courteous," "truthful," and "of a clean and wholesome mind" (122-

26). After giving examples in which newspapers do not display these qualities, Scott argues for a kind of media literacy training in English classes, aimed at encouraging a specific set of values in the public rhetorical instruction provided by journalists. Since the newspaper is not likely to go away, he says, teachers should "enlighten" students in what they ought to expect and demand from journalists, with the aim of effecting eventual improvement in the products (127).

Scott's primary concern here is the moral force of journalism in society. With this emphasis, his argument represents the humanist tradition in which rhetoric is valued for its ability to inculcate cultural ideals and produce a "normative subject," as Atwill puts it. Invoking a Christian standard of morality, as Angell did in his comments on faculty qualifications, Scott remarks that the newspaper has not only replaced the Bible as the daily reading material for Christian families but has surpassed the Bible in prominence by exerting influence on "un-Christian" families as well. "It is the newspaper which now sinks into the lives of our young people, and, filling their minds with its phrases and its pictures, shapes their characters and supplies the motives for their conduct" (120). Concerned with the newspaper's role in character formation, Scott personifies the newspaper and urges it to behave as a "gentleman" rather than a "boor or a cad" (123). He dedicates the majority of his argument to this aspect of the newspaper's influence, suggesting ways in which teachers can lead students to distinguish "good" journalism (i.e., that which is courteous, truthful,

etc.) from "bad" (128-30), instruction he presumes will lead eventually to better journalism.[47]

He ends by addressing a more "urgent need," to prepare students to gain as much as possible from the news they currently receive. At this point the argument shifts focus from journalists' rhetoric to citizens' rhetoric, as Scott advises the audience on how to get the most benefit from a newspaper. Even so, the argument remains more supportive of the humanist tradition of rhetoric than of the technē tradition. Opposing two methods of reading, "the idle man's way and the busy man's way" (130-31), Scott advocates teaching students the latter. Instead of approaching the newspaper in a "lazy, thoughtless mood," seeking distraction and amusement, readers should approach it with a sense of civic purpose, he explains. The busy person "says" to the paper: "'Come, now, I have a few pertinent questions I want to ask you, questions of politics, foreign affairs, business, and happenings at home and abroad that I must know about in order to be a good citizen'" (131).

In this characterization, the newspaper has become a source of information, rather than a persuasive rhetor exhorting its audience to debased morals; it contains potentially valuable material for the citizen who will read it

---

[47] With this remark Scott echoes the distinction between good and bad rhetoric made by Socrates in Plato's Gorgias. In "Rhetoric Rediviva," Scott quotes the passage in which Socrates admits that "'rhetoric is of two sorts: one, which is mere flattery . . .; the other, which is noble and aims at the training and improvement of the souls of the citizens, and strives to say what is best, whether welcome or unwelcome, to the audience'" (Gorgias, sec. 503, The Dialogues of Plato, trans. Benjamin Jowett, 3rd. ed., Oxford University Press, 1892, II: 394; qtd. in "Rhetoric Rediviva" 415).

rhetorically. However, Scott's characterization of the citizen is contingent primarily on knowledge, rather than the uses to which the citizen might put that knowledge (e.g., intervention or invention). The newspaper contains information "pertinent" to citizenship itself; Scott does not mention the possibility that citizens might find topoi from which to invent arguments of their own on public issues. Rather, the newspaper merely presents items the reader "must know about in order to be a good citizen." The informed citizen is a normative subject, congruent with the humanist concept of rhetorical education, in which the student attains a certain body or kind of knowledge.[48] Knowledge implies virtue: Presumably, the informed citizen, like the courteous and truthful newspaper, will provide a civilizing influence on society--not through active intervention, but by embodying a cultural ideal.

In "Rhetoric Rediviva," delivered before the Modern Language Association in 1909, Scott again advances a humanist tradition of rhetoric, while also situating journalism firmly within rhetoric's purview. The paper's purpose is to issue a "plea for the revival of rhetoric as a science," specifically at the level of graduate study (413). Scott's foundationalist assumption of a theory-practice binary is clear as he stipulates a definition of science, listing three criteria: a "distinct and unified subject-matter" that will reward prolonged investigation, an empirical method of research, and an end of locating a "body of interlocking principles, laws and classifications" (414). He argues that rhetoric meets these criteria, if viewed from the perspective of Plato rather than Aristotle.

[48] The "informed citizen" and its limiting effect on democratic participation are discussed further in chapter three.

Scott opines that the history of rhetoric, to the detriment of its development as a science, was overly influenced by the works of Korax and Aristotle,[49] which emphasized practice of the art. He condemns Aristotle's Rhetoric as too concerned with success in persuasion, thereby neglecting the search for truth (414). Aristotle's Rhetoric proved so influential, Scott claims,

> Not the invention of paper and printing, which shifted the center of gravity from spoken to written discourse, not the rise of fiction, the essay, and other forms of prose to an equality with the oration or the forensic plea, not even the organization of those great modes of intercommunication, the magazine and the newspaper, could avail to break its hold. (414)

With this claim Scott implies that the genres he mentions--fiction, the essay, and the discourses of journalism--rightly belong under the heading of "rhetoric," but have been denied their place in rhetorical study because Aristotle did not consider them in his lectures.[50]

---

[49] Ancient rhetoricians including Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian credit Corax (as the name is more often spelled now in American texts) as the inventor of rhetoric, around 476 BCE. As Katula and Murphy explain, Corax is believed to have "devised a systematic approach to argument" to address the reappropriation of land under new Athenian democracy. Assuming that in such matters absolute truth was practically impossible to discover, Corax's system of argument focused on probability, or persuading jurists on the likelihood of one claim as compared to others (19). Corax, like Aristotle, thus presents the use of rhetoric in the realm of contingent truths. Scott did not accept Aristotle's allowance for a category of contingent truths to be consulted in areas of human activity such as politics.

[50] Aristotle, focusing on rhetoric as a means of arriving at public judgments, outlines the use of the art in deliberative, judicial, and ceremonial forums. As I argue in chapter one, Aristotle's category of epideictic rhetoric, used to invent and maintain public judgments of value through ceremonial speeches, can be extended to include journalistic genres, but on a public-forming basis rather than the truth-preserving basis that Scott posits. The key difference is that Scott's idea of democracy was to disseminate the values embodied in existing

Supporting his claim that Plato retrieved rhetoric "from the narrow arts of persuasion" and conferred upon it the concerns of a science, Scott approves of the broad conception of rhetoric he attributes to Plato:

> In his [Plato's] view, the proper subject-matter of the science [of rhetoric] is not a particular type or mode of speech, such as persuasion or oratory, but . . . speech-craft, the dynamics of speech wheresoever and howsoever employed. It includes every use of speech, whether spoken or written; not only speeches, but history, fiction, laws, and even conversation. The field is so wide as to embrace all modes of communication current in Plato's time, and to anticipate in a degree, those of later times. (415)

Certainly the anticipated "modes" of "later times" would include the journalistic writing Scott mentioned earlier. As this passage indicates, while Scott envisioned rhetoric as broadly concerned with all types of social discourses including those of journalism, he also adhered to the foundationalist theory-practice binary that Atwill finds limiting to rhetoric as a democratic power. Scott presumes the art of rhetoric to be governed by a "body" of laws (414). The "distinct and unified" nature he posits for the science that governs the art ("Rhetoric Rediviva" 414) further indicates rhetoric's stability, and as Atwill suggests, this stable nature diminishes rhetoric's adaptability in arriving at contingent truths in different contexts. Citing Gorgias and Phaedrus, Scott argues that Plato "took toward [rhetoric] the attitude, if not of the scientist, at least of the speculative philosopher intent solely upon the truth" ("Rhetoric Redidiva" 415). Scott's use of the definite article in "the truth" implies an acceptance of Plato's notion of absolute truth that governed all situations, political as well as philosophical.

---

social orders, whereas the technē tradition allows for new constituencies to form around judgments that may potentially oppose the status quo.

Scott also implies a foundational epistemology in his explication of Plato's scientific-philosophical approach to rhetoric. According to Scott, Plato addresses two fundamental principles of the art of rhetoric, one "relating . . . to function," the other "to form and structure" (415). With the functional principle, Plato expounds a "social or sociological point of view," that "[t]he value of any piece of discourse . . . is to be measured by its effect upon the welfare of the community" (Scott, "Rhetoric Rediviva" 415). Scott explains, "Good discourse is that which by disseminating truth creates a healthy public opinion and thus effects, in Plato's words, 'a training and improvement in the souls of the citizens'" ("Rhetoric Rediviva" 415).[51] The assumption of one truth "disseminated" by a rhetor, rather than contingent truths invented by deliberating publics, severely limits rhetoric's potential as an art central to democratic processes.

The formal principle Scott attributes to Plato is that of "organic unity," which he derives from Socrates' metaphor of a living body to describe a speech in the Phaedrus ("Rhetoric Rediviva" 415, Phaedrus 134).[52] Scott interprets Plato as suggesting that a piece of discourse is an organic whole, comprised of mutually dependent parts. This idea accords a living, breathing responsiveness to rhetoric that the mechanistic models suggested in current-traditional pedagogy do not. Scott's contention that discourse grows from and responds to social needs rather

---

[51] Scott quotes Plato's Gorgias, as indicated in note 47.

[52] Scott finds this idea significant and long overlooked, reappearing only in the nineteenth century (416). He cites Herbert Spencer's 1852 Philosophy of Style as the first work on discourse "comparable to Plato's in breadth and insight" (416). Scott published an 1895 edition of this work, which proved influential on his own rhetorical thought, as Stewart and Stewart point out (37-38).

than conforming to inert rules of textual form was thus a refreshing departure from leading theories of his time (Berlin, Rhetoric and Reality 47, Writing Instruction 77; Kitzhaber 71; Stewart, "Rediscovering" 545). However, this flexible view of rhetoric as a social, organic art did not preclude Scott from adopting as well Plato's foundational epistemology.

This reading of Scott's rhetorical theory differs with that of Berlin, who cites "Rhetoric Reviviva" as evidence that Scott represents an early example of "transacational rhetoric" that is "epistemic" and democratic (Rhetoric and Reality 15-16, 46-49). Berlin delineates transactional rhetoric as being

> based on an epistemology that sees truth as arising out of the interaction of the elements of the rhetorical situation: an interaction of subject and object or of subject and audience or even of all the elements--subject, object, audience, and language--operating simultaneously. (Rhetoric and Reality 15)

Among three forms of transactional rhetoric, Berlin identifies Scott's as "epistemic," which may be viewed as unadulterated transacational rhetoric in that it involves "transaction" among "all elements of the rhetorical situation" (16); Berlin finds two other forms of transacational rhetoric, classical and cognitive, to be limited in different ways.[53]

---

[53] The classical operates within a limited realm of knowledge, and the cognitive is concerned primarily with individual learning processes. Although he does not cite Aristotle, Berlin basically restates Aristotle's concept of rhetoric in describing the classical form of transactional rhetoric: "Truth is here located in a social construct involving the interaction of interlocutor and audience (or discourse community)," but only within the "rhetorical realm" of contingent meanings. The discourses of logic and science "are outside the rhetorical realm since both are concerned with the indisputable, with certainties that do not ordinarily lead to disagreement" (Rhetoric and Reality 15). Cognitive rhetoric, which developed in the 1960s and 70s from cognitive-psychology theories of learning, is transactional in its view of the individual as "arriving at truth through

In Scott's concern for the social contexts of rhetoric, Berlin finds evidence that "Scott saw reality as a social construction, a communal creation emerging from the dialectical interplay of individuals" (Rhetoric and Reality 47). He adds,

> While this social reality is bound by the material, it is everywhere immersed in language. Reality is thus neither objective and external, as current-traditionalists believed, nor subjective and internal, as the proponents of liberal culture held. It is instead the result of the interaction between the experience of the external world and what the perceiver brings to this experience. (Rhetoric and Reality 47)

As Berlin argues, Scott's work repeatedly attends to social contexts and implications of language use. The articles Berlin cites are apt choices to illustrate these concerns: "English Composition as a Mode of Behavior" (Rhetoric and Reality 48, Writing Instruction 78-79), "The Standard of American Speech" (Writing Instruction 80-81), and "Two Ideals of Composition Teaching" (Writing Instruction 80). These and other works clearly show Scott's belief that composing is a "mode of behavior," a human, social phenomenon. People write and speak out of a desire to communicate with others for various purposes; Scott argues consistently that rhetorical study and teaching need to attend to these social aspects (e.g., "English Composition," "Standard," "Two Ideals," "Verbal Taboos," "Poetry"). However, he stops short of claiming that knowledge itself is socially constructed; he does not propose that people use rhetoric to invent new knowledge. Scott's advocacy of Plato's concept of rhetoric as a means of seeking "the" truth and his rationale for the study of rhetoric as a science testify to a larger conception of the bounds of reality than merely the "material," as Berlin suggests.

---

engaging the surrounding material and social environment" (Berlin, Rhetoric and Reality 15-16).

At most, in Scott's estimation, rhetoric helps people discover already existing reality, abstract as well as material.

Berlin also overstates Scott's opposition to the "scientific and practical" bent of current-traditional rhetoric (Rhetoric and Reality 47, Writing Instruction 77). That Scott positioned himself against Harvard's proponents of the "current-traditional" approach, as Berlin argues, is evident from previous discussion in this chapter. However, while Scott also opposed Harvard's rule- and form-based skills orientation ("Verbal Taboos," "English Composition"), he did not categorically reject what Berlin calls its "scientific" basis. (Nor did he oppose "practical" aims in rhetorical instruction, as evidenced by his dedication to vocational instruction in journalism.) According to Berlin, the "attempt to be scientific in rhetoric was based on the assumption that knowledge in all areas of human behavior could be readily discovered and validated through the scientific method" (Rhetoric and Reality 36-37). While I doubt Scott would have agreed that "all" principles of language use would be "readily" derived from scientific study, in "Rhetoric Rediviva" he argues explicitly for the use of scientific method in rhetorical research. After interpreting Plato's "scientific or philosophical attitude" toward rhetoric, Scott advocates the study of a specific "science" of rhetoric, which he describes as "an investigation of the phenomena of speech-communication. It is the science of human intercourse so far as this is conducted by speech or the symbols of speech" (417). Furthermore he recommends consulting research in sociology and psychology, which he finds intimately related to rhetoric. As examples of rhetorical topics that would benefit from

psychological research, he suggests "those in regard to internal speech, the nature of rhythm, the theory of expression, the mental images aroused by certain classes of words, [and] the basis of motive, choice, and volition" (417).

Scott's scholarship exemplifies this scientific inspiration, venturing into topics and methods that would later appear in areas such as discourse analysis, rhetoric of science or inquiry, and writing-process studies. In the latter half of the twentieth century, this research would indeed embrace social-constructivist thought, but Scott did not go that far. In "The Genesis of Speech," an article that grew out of his invited lectures from 1910 to 1915 to students in a Psychology of Language course at Michigan (UM Catalogs), he draws on work in sociology, psychology, and anthropology to theorize about the human impulse to communicate. In several articles on American speech, poetry, and prose, he analyzes various patterns of discourse and speculates on their social and psychological significance (e.g., "The Standard of American Speech," "The Order of Words in Certain Rhythm-Groups," "The Most Fundamental Differentia of Poetry and Prose," and "The Scansion of Prose Rhythm").

Scott's view of rhetoric as a science was unquestionably expansive and original, but as Steven Mailloux shows in "Disciplinary Identities," appeals to science in rhetorical study and the study of scientific rhetoric as a social construct represent two distinct moments in rhetorical history, separated by decades. Evident throughout the body of Scott's work is the "naïve empiricism" that Michael Schudson finds prevalent in academic and journalistic thought roughly from the 1890s through World War I (Discovering 74-75, 155). Scott pursued

empirical study of rhetoric as he proposed in "Rhetoric Rediviva," in the belief that it would yield insight into fundamental principles of language use.

Advocating similar study in journalism, Scott clearly articulates a rationale supported by pure-research and liberal-culture ideals in higher education. In "Training for Journalism," Scott remarks that "the body of knowledge about the newspaper that has up to the present time been scientifically organized, is comparatively scant" (6).[54] He expresses hope that journalism might become a discipline that would include the pursuit of knowledge as its own end--the point of convergence Veysey finds in pure-research and liberal-culture aims. "Some day," Scott projects, "the study of the theory and history and procedure of the newspaper may be carried to a point where, in supplying intellectual nourishment to growing minds, it will rival mathematics, logic, or political science" (7). With the potential to provide "intellectual nourishment," journalism thus might find a place among the traditional liberal arts.

---

[54] "Training for Journalism" is an undated paper, apparently intended for oral presentation, though it is unclear on what occasion(s) Scott may have delivered it. He probably first drafted it around 1912 and last revised it after 1925, as he makes use of catalog descriptions from that year. This paper may be the "journalist paper" Scott mentions working on in diary entries for June 20 and 21, 1912, and may have been intended for use at the founding meeting of American Conference of Teachers of Journalism (later American Association of Teachers of Journalism) on 30 November 1912. Patricia L. Stewart suggests that Scott may have prepared the paper for a meeting of the student journalism fraternity at the University of Michigan (letter to author). He attended many such events, including a Sigma Delta Chi banquet on 1 March 1913, mentioned in his diary. I suspect he last updated the paper in anticipation of the Press Congress of the World meeting in September 1926, though he did not attend due to illness, as Stewart and Stewart point out (173).

Scott simultaneously argues that journalism's development as an element of liberal education depends on scientific research. Journalism cannot advance in academe, he says, until "hundreds of 'pale, preliminary scholars' have patiently investigated the phenomena and recorded their conclusions" ("Training for Journalism" 7). To foster this gradual, methodical progress, Scott proposes a "graduate school in journalism, not to train reporters or editorial writers, but for purely scientific research in the theory and history of publication" (7). Furthermore, he deems advanced study essential "if journalism is to attain and preserve a place among the learned professions" (7).

Scott mentions two books worthy of graduate study, exemplars of the research he envisions: Walter Lippmann's Public Opinion, and Helen O. Mahin's The Development and Significance of the Newspaper Headline (7). Notably the latter is a PhD thesis written under Scott's direction and published in 1924. Mahin, who began teaching journalism at the University of Kansas in 1920 before proceeding to the University of Michigan for her doctorate (AEJMC 18), also edited a book of editorials by William Allen White from his career as editor of Emporia Gazette in Kansas. Despite Scott's argument for what would clearly be PhD-level study in journalism, there is no mention of doctoral work, even that of Mahin, in Brumm's history of the University of Michigan's journalism department. Neither does Michigan appear as a doctoral-granting institution in Albert Alton Sutton's 1940 study of journalism programs; only the University of Missouri is listed as offering a "doctor's degree in journalism" (48). As in the

field of rhetoric, in journalism Scott held a minority view on the merits of doctoral training.

Scott's Pedagogy: Aspiring to Platonic Ideals

As a teacher as well as scholar, Scott pursued a humanist tradition of rhetoric that sought to preserve and disseminate cultural values. In "Two Ideals of Composition Teaching," presented before the Indiana Association of Teachers of English in 1911, he expresses his aspiration to Plato's ideal of philosophical teaching. In this address, as in "Rhetoric Rediviva," Scott defends his preference by contrasting Plato's ideas with those of Aristotle. He asks teachers to consider whether they are guided by the ideals of Aristotle--which he again portrays as being too heavily influenced by "the school of Korax" (39)--or by the ideals of Plato as espoused in the Phaedrus. Scott forcefully argues for Plato's ideal of seeking "'the training and improvement of the souls of the citizens'" (39). He describes this ideal as founded upon the "distinction between the true rhetoric and the false" and as lying "at the other pole from that of Aristotle" (40). From a "popular book on composition," Scott recounts several reasons commonly cited for studying rhetoric:

> Good English marks the gentleman; . . . a command of English will enable you to win a law-suit, to carry an election, to write a successful novel, to become a highly-paid editor or newspaper correspondent. All these . . . are instances in which the ideal held up before the learner is that of success. (40-41)

He says he does not object to these aims "in themselves," but rather, he suggests "the danger lies in making them primary instead of subordinate; . . . in substituting a low and temporary ideal for a high and abiding one" (41).

Ostensibly, then, Scott proposes Plato's ideal against both cultural and vocational aims. Scott's description of Plato's ideal, however, accords with Atwill's reading of it; Scott advocates a humanist tradition of rhetoric that supports liberal culture ideals, despite the mild protest to the contrary implied in his criticism of rhetoric as a gentleman's credential.

As in "The Undefended Gate," the use of rhetoric to impart culture and develop character is of primary concern in this argument. Offering the example of a magazine story, "The Married Lovers," whose plot he does not summarize, Scott suggests that by the standards of Korax and Aristotle, the story would be judged "good." It is skillfully written, the magazine bought it, and it "helped to sell the magazine" (43). Judged by Plato's ideals, Scott finds the story wanting, though not on moral grounds, he insists. "I will not say that from the moral viewpoint the story is suggestive, . . . or corrupting to the young, . . . or that it tends to break down the distinctions between right and wrong. I put all these things aside," he states (44). His objection is that "the writer has yet to learn the one great requisite of English composition[,] . . . that mastery of the mother-tongue carries with it the obligation to use this great instrument for the training and instruction of the souls of the citizens" (44). If a student had turned in this story, Scott declares he would have rejected it "by saying that to use the English language for such low and sordid ends was little less than criminal" (44). Scott does not specify the "low and sordid ends" he has in mind. If in fact he does not mean merely the inculcation of bad morals, then he probably means to imply that the writer has used rhetoric for monetary gain without imparting truth or

otherwise contributing to the good of society. Either way, the crux of the objection is the same; following his interpretation of Plato, Scott posits not only an absolute truth but also a predetermined idea of what is good for society. Rhetoric does not help citizens decide what is best for them at a given moment; at most it can help the wisest ones discover a good that is already out there so they may lead others to see and work toward that good. Knowledge of truth and social good is a virtue; imparting pre-existing truth is the duty of the good rhetor.

Scott's support for his Platonic ideal of teaching reveals that the truth he considers universal is in fact unmistakably culture-bound. To the anticipated objection that his proposed pedagogical ideal "runs counter . . . to all the currents of this age, whose god is success and whose temple is the market-place," Scott counters with his "faith" that Plato's "nobler principle will prevail" (45). The two reasons he presents in support of this faith clearly state the racial and religious specificity--and the bigotry--of his cultural ideals. One is that "the Platonic view is more nearly akin to the deepest and most abiding characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race," an inclination toward things "genuine and real, not formal and superficial" (45). The second is that Plato's ideal embodies "the fundamental principle of Christianity--that man can save himself only by giving what is best in him to his fellow-men" (45). Scott may not advocate an education "befitting a gentleman," but he clearly favors one that is grounded in specific ethnic and religious traditions. In two swift sentences, he universalizes white, Christian,

Anglo-Saxon values, holding them up as ideals worthy of emulation by all of his students.[55]

Scott applies Platonic ideals to journalism instruction as well, suggesting that university-trained journalists can become a humanizing force in society, imparting to wider audiences the cultural values associated with higher education. In "Training for Journalism," he expresses his desire for journalists to "be put in possession of the basic standards by which true journalism can be distinguished from false" (6), again invoking Plato's notion of true and false arts. With the proper course of study, Scott maintains, a college-trained journalist should understand the "essential principles" of the newspaper and be able to "detect the vital means by which it affects the public mind and conscience for good or ill in the formation of public opinion" (6). Raising again the tension between vocational and liberal arts, Scott comments that the kind of training he recommends should make it impossible for the journalist to think of the newspaper as "merely a device for making money," a tool to be corrupted for personal gain, or a mouthpiece for expression of political prejudice (6). In effect, such a program could prepare a journalist to be a good rhetor, in the Platonic

[55] He was by no means alone in making such overt arguments for the universal adoption or preservation of particular cultural values. Burton J. Bledstein recounts that Harvard's President Charles W. Eliot worried over the depletion of "'the white race'" through such afflictions as venereal disease and alcoholism, which he attributed to vice and thus called "'race suicide'" (qtd. in Bledstein 156). Of most concern to Eliot was "'that the highly educated part of the American people does not increase the population at all, but on the contrary fails to reproduce itself'" (qtd. in Bledstin 156).

tradition Scott advocates in "Two Ideals" and "Rhetoric Revivia," one who would seek to improve citizens' very souls by leading them to truth.

To train such a journalist-rhetor, Scott outlines and argues for the kind of journalism curriculum offered at Michigan. He first presents the program's three aims:

> 1. That every student who is looking forward to the profession of journalism, should acquire at least the rudiments of a liberal education.
>
> 2. That every such student should acquire a knowledge of the history or evolution of the newspaper and its underlying principles as a social institution of the highest importance.
>
> 3. That every such student should learn the essentials of newspaper technique and procedure, and secure, by long and hard practice in composition, as much readiness, ease, and correctness in writing the English language as may properly be expected--expected, that is, from persons who are compelled to put their ideas on paper with great rapidity and, in general, without an opportunity for revision. ("Training for Journalism" 2)

He then contrasts this program with what he calls--"without prejudice," he notes--"the commercial college type" of training, adding that his university has "neither time nor taste" for this type (3). Students come to the university for "what they cannot get elsewhere," Scott explains, not "merely" for the skills to make a living, although he remarks that he has no "objection" to earning a living (3). The aim of college journalism students, Scott maintains, is "to find entrance to one of the greatest of the learned professions, a profession which opens up for them the opportunity for a noble and distinguished career" (3). Scott assumes university students deserve a broad liberal-arts preparation, regardless of their chosen fields. Prospective journalists are no exception. With this argument for college

instruction for journalists, Scott lends support to a wider effort to professionalize journalism, a movement discussed further in chapter three.

Scott's affinity for a Platonic concept of teaching--one which leads students to apprehend truth--is further evident in the way he conducted his classes. His preferred teaching method was the seminar, or "seminary," as it was often called then, shortened from the Latin term, seminarium, used in Germany. Introduced simultaneously at Michigan by Charles Kendall Adams and at Harvard by Henry Adams in the 1870s, the seminar gained wide use, particularly in graduate schools, within a decade (Veysey 102n, 154).[56] As in the laboratory method used in science courses, the seminar gave students in other courses the opportunity to learn disciplinary discourse practices by becoming co-workers or colleagues with scholars who were leaders in their fields (Veysey 153-55). Veysey associates the seminar with research goals in higher education and remarks that it was imbued with contradictory values, centered on inductive investigation of impersonal facts, which were believed to reveal incontrovertible truths, and yet also largely personality-driven (156). His characterization of the American seminar as "charismatic in quality" (156) is reminiscent of the Platonic ideal of teaching illustrated in the Phaedrus, which Scott presented as an exemplar ("Two Ideals").

The charisma involved in this understanding of the highest aims of education is prominent in student accounts of Scott's seminar teaching. Helen

[56] Wilfred B. Shaw states that the University of Michigan "in all probability" was the first U.S. university to use the seminar (12); judging by Veysey's account, Shaw is half right.

Ogden Mahin, the doctoral student and University of Kansas journalism professor, is typical in her praise of Scott's highly personal teaching.[57] Introducing her essay, "Half-Lights," a tribute to Scott, as "a confession of faith" (1), she proceeds with a series of metaphors to evoke her learning experience, effectively imitating the teaching she describes. "I made a great many discoveries" at Scott's seminar table, she relates, particularly about "critical theory" and literary appreciation. "But precisely what was Professor Scott's theory I find I cannot altogether say, its leading was so much more interesting than the mere substance of any theory" (Mahin, "Half-Lights" 1). Her recourse is to offer a metaphor of "going into a realm of lights and shadows, of sunlit peaks and deep green valleys, and self-forgetfully mingling" with thinkers past and present (1).

Mahin's description echoes the seminar's paradoxically impersonal research imperative taught by profoundly personal means. "Critically, with the fine discrimination that both knows true beauty and accepts the ugly when it is embodied in strength, Professor Scott did much less of imparting than of inspiring," she writes (2). For Mahin, learning the course material, even theory, which she deems "the basis of education" and the "foundation for future study," is less important than gaining the ability to apprehend meaning from various encounters in one's life, in and out of school. She elaborates, "[E]very theory has an end. The happiness of intellectual living has no end. Deep calleth unto deep"

[57] Ray Stannard Baker gives a similar account of his experiences in two of Scott's seminars (252-56). For further insights into Scott's teaching, see Stewart and Stewart 27-28, 137, 201, and 212.

(3). In her view Scott represented the utmost in college teaching, for he led students to a mode of "intellectual living," in which they could comprehend the Platonic truth in everyday experience. If Scott strove to inspire his students to higher learning by his own example, Mahin was one journalism student who deemed him a success.

Scott's Journalism Curriculum: Liberal-Vocational Tensions

Although Scott left no journalism syllabi or course notes, the curriculum as described in university catalogs reflects his vision, including the vocational-liberal arts tensions evident elsewhere in his work. Scott's correspondence and diaries provide additional information on the program. Placing the study of journalism as public discourse at the pinnacle of the student's education, his curriculum resembled Isocrates' rhetoric-centered paideia in the technē tradition, more than it did Plato's philosophical pursuit of enduring truth. Theory and practice were tightly interwoven, to provide journalists not only with professional skills but also with an understanding of the public contexts in which they would apply those skills. At the same time, course topics provide evidence of a rift that would develop later between professional- and public-minded approaches to journalism teaching. Nevertheless, Scott largely succeeded in creating a journalism program that entailed the broad learning characteristic of a classical rhetorical education. Ironically, the success of this endeavor brought into sharp relief the difference between journalism and rhetoric under Scott's direction, the former oriented toward public practice, the latter toward scholastic study.

Separate faculties and course sequences underscored this difference, creating a dividing line between the two subjects.

Scott introduced journalism instruction at the University of Michigan in the spring of 1891 with Rapid Writing, offered for three years. A decade later, when Scott became chair of the newly formed Department of Rhetoric, he began building a journalism curriculum. In 1903-04, the department's first year, he taught Newspaper Writing: Theory and Practice. This course was reserved, as Rapid Writing had been, for upper-division students who had already completed the core liberal arts requirements (UM Catalog 1903-04, 82)--a trend that continued throughout Scott's tenure. In 1905-06, he added Reporting and Editorial Work, for editors and reporters of student publications. In 1911-12 a two-semester sequence, The Newspaper and Newspaper Writing, replaced the one-semester Newspaper Writing: Theory and Practice. This handful of offerings comprised the journalism program at the University of Michigan through 1915-16 and served thereafter as its foundation. In these first 12 years, Scott taught most of the journalism courses, with occasional help from other rhetoric faculty.

Beginning in 1916-17, several changes in the catalog listings indicate that journalism was acquiring an identity distinct from rhetoric, though they shared a department. While something like a major had existed since 1909-10 (UM Catalog 212), the program now assumed a higher profile, with a description of "Curricula in Journalism" appearing ahead of departmental listings, in the general section devoted to the Department (or College) of Literature, Science and the Arts (UM Catalog 138-39). In the rhetoric department's section, journalism courses

appeared for the first time in their own sub-section (189)--a change that often preceded the formation of departments, as in the formation of Rhetoric from English and Psychology from Philosophy. Journalism offerings also doubled, from four to eight courses. New courses included Editorial Writing and one in Special Feature and Magazine Articles. Other additions came from the expansion of existing courses: The Newspaper became a two-semester course, for example, and a separate two-semester sequence was added, consisting of a Seminary in the Newspaper, its Nature, Function, and Development and a Seminary in the Newspaper. Finally Scott assigned all but one of the courses to a junior faculty member whose primary mission was journalism teaching. In the next year, 1917-18, Scott left all of the journalism courses to another faculty member, while he taught rhetoric courses. This situation remained in effect through Scott's retirement in 1927. Brumm, who had joined the department in 1905, did most of the teaching in journalism and none in rhetoric from 1918-19 on.

Two other significant changes occurred between 1921 and 1923, further demarcating journalism and rhetoric. In 1921-22 the Department of Rhetoric was renamed the Department of Rhetoric and Journalism, and in 1922-23 the catalog announced a certificate in journalism for those who completed the curriculum with at least a B average. Scott and Brumm each assumed the title Professor of Rhetoric and Journalism when the department was renamed, although when Scott retired he chose to be called Professor Emeritus of Rhetoric.

For those who pursued this course of study, journalism instruction, like rhetoric in Isocrates' paideia, represented an educational capstone. As Scott

outlined in "Training for Journalism," and as was the case in many of the leading programs outlined in chapter three, journalists at Michigan studied a broad liberal-arts curriculum before entering the major in their junior year. At that point, they received courses in the theory and history of the press as well as practice in rhetorical skills--writing and editing in the various journalistic genres. The core bachelor-of-arts courses comprised the foundational liberal-arts portion of the program, yet with an eye toward the journalist's application of this knowledge in public life. Among the core subjects were mathematics, political science, economics, sociology, history, English literature, sciences, and foreign or ancient languages. Journalism students would vary the emphasis among these courses depending on whether they chose to follow the "general curriculum" in journalism or one of four "special curricula." A concentration was offered in "history, government, and politics," another in "economics and sociology," a third in reviewing of drama, art, and music, and a fourth in "technical journalism" (UM Catalog 1922-23, 159-60).

The second portion of the journalism curriculum integrated theory and practice in a coherent effort to prepare students for their profession of public rhetorical practice. Some courses covered theory and practice together. Elements of Journalism, for example, an introduction to the major that first appeared in 1921, provided a "study of the organization and function of the public press" in addition to practice in news-gathering (UM Catalog 1921-22, 370). History and Principles of Journalism also combined journalistic theory with practice in reporting (UM Catalog 1921-22, 370). Other courses emphasized theory or

practice, but all shared the common goal of preparing the student to assume a public role.

Within this vocational coherence, two approaches are evident, one oriented toward the social-political contexts of reporting and the other emphasizing professional skills seen as transferable across contexts. These approaches would later mark competing schools of thought in journalism study (Adams, Progressive Politics 70-94; Sutton 14-16), discussed in chapter three, though they did not contribute to the separation of journalism from rhetoric at Michigan. Instead, they reflect an incipient conflict that seems to have motivated Scott's effort to keep the two subjects together.

In rhetorical terms, the public-context approach is characteristic of classical or civic rhetoric, while the professional-skills approach resembles current-traditional rhetoric (Clark and Halloran). Scott's program contained elements of each. The Country Newspaper, for example, offered in 1921-22, and The Community newspaper, offered in 1925-26, prepared students to practice journalism in a classically rhetorical sense, in a context conceptualized as a social and political community. In courses such as Editorial Writing, Feature Writing, or Magazine Writing, far more prevalent in Scott's program from 1916-17 on, journalism is envisioned more as a set of specialized skills, defined in terms of professional organizations (newspapers, magazines, advertising agencies) and professional genres (editorials, features, advertisement copy). While the professional-skills approach shared with literary study a formal perspective of genre, English faculty apparently did not recognize this similarity as constituting a

significant link between journalism and literature. Rather, journalism, whether approached from a public-context or professional-skills perspective, was to the literary mindset what Scott called a vocational or commercial subject, as opposed to an imaginative or philosophical one ("Poetry" 100-102; "Training" 3). While Scott urged a blend of both cultural and vocational aims in education, his arguments imply that prevailing opinion maintained a fairly strict dichotomy between the two.

Scott's writings clearly indicate his awareness of the skills-oriented view of journalism instruction and his wish to avoid too close an adherence to that approach ("Training," "Poetry"). He contended that the pursuit of commercial success ought to be balanced with spiritual and philosophical insight, the latter element being a key distinguishing feature of college education. Most likely Scott feared that journalism, if severed entirely from his Platonically inspired rhetoric program, would devolve into the skills training he associated with the "commercial college type" of instruction ("Training" 3).

In a letter of November 27, 1923, Rankin articulates this concern about the journalism program at Michigan (FNSP). Rankin writes to Scott, who was on leave in Europe,

> I do not believe that I have any new or even modified opinions about changes in Journalism. I know, of course, that Mr. Brumm is very anxious to establish a School of Journalism apart from the Department of Rhetoric, . . . I am inclined to think that the Department of Rhetoric would be better off without the present association, but, on the other hand, more especially inclined to think that Journalism is better off tied up with the Department of Rhetoric than it would be floating loose. (1)[58]

[58] Stewart and Stewart also quote this letter (172-73).

Rankin's worry is not about journalism's viability as a department, he says, but about the direction it might take as a subject of study. "The problem is whether it might become, under the wing of the University, what is not quite in the University's field" (1). Rankin's comment echoes Scott's distinction between commercial-college and university education in "Training for Journalism."

Scott's concept of journalism as rhetorical practice in a civic sense probably is what kept English professors from taking the journalism courses when they took over those in rhetoric. In journalism Scott succeeded in blending liberal-culture ideals with the utilitarian aims of vocational training to an extent that he did not achieve in the rest of his rhetoric curriculum. Journalism represented the public-practice arm of his rhetoric department, although he did not depict the program in those terms.

The specificity of Scott's journalism training, whether viewed as "professional" or "public," lay in its extra-academic orientation, while the rhetoric courses, like those in literature, were oriented toward academic concerns. As with the journalism curriculum, the rudiments of Scott's rhetoric curriculum were in place at the department's formation in 1903. The headnote to the rhetoric department offerings describes "three principal kinds" of courses: 1) those that give students "practice in the leading types of prose composition" (included here is Newspaper Writing: Theory and Practice), 2) those that cover "fundamental principles of Rhetoric and Criticism," and 3) those that combine "advanced composition" with "rhetorical and critical theory" (UM Catalog 1903-04, 81). In 1914-15 the first category remains the same, what was formerly the third one

becomes the second, and a new category is listed third, describing those courses designed for students "preparing for newspaper work" (UM Catalog 1914-15, 173). Throughout Scott's time as chair, the department's introductory rhetoric sequence retained an academic-skills focus, with its "aim to promote clearness and correctness of expression through practice in the simpler kinds of composition" (UM Catalog 1903-04, 81; UM Catalog 1926-27, 407). The department also offered two semesters of Advanced Composition and Rhetoric, recommended for sophomores. Scott's opposition to Harvard's approach notwithstanding, these second-year courses were based on the modes of composition associated with current-traditional rhetoric, covering description and narration in the fall and exposition in the spring. The lower division courses thus were presented as giving students practice in scholastic writing.

Upper-level rhetoric offerings also reflect an academic focus. The courses combining criticism and composition, which emphasized literary criticism, suggest an easy fit within the English department. Throughout his career, Scott frequently taught an advanced composition course that illustrates this rhetoric-literature connection. In 1893-94, his course 18, previously Rapid Writing, became Advanced Composition, a seminar limited to six students and "intended for those who are already proficient in writing, but who feel the need of practice and criticism" (UM Catalog 1893-94, 64). In 1902-03 the course is additionally described as "Essays in Exposition. Interpretations of Literature and Art" (UM Catalog, 76). With the formation of the rhetoric department in 1903-04, this course disappears amid re-numberings and new offerings, but one very similar to

it is course 7, Interpretations of Literature and Art (UM Catalog 82). Scott frequently taught the Interpretations course from that time forward. Described as "[a] discussion of critical principles and their application in the appreciation and interpretation of specimens of literature and art," the course resembles Principles of Literary Criticism, taught by Isaac Demmon in English (UM Catalog 1903-04, 80).

Criticism, in fact, was taught under the auspices of English, rhetoric, and journalism, and thus provides a point of comparison among disciplinary emphases. Before rhetoric separated from English, the English department offered course 19, Seminary in Rhetoric and the Principles of Literary Criticism, described as "[r]eading and discussion of the whole or of parts of some standard work or works in Rhetoric and Literary Criticism;" in 1886-87, the work covered was Aristotle's Rhetoric (UM Catalog 48). In 1890-91, Scott taught course 10, with an almost identical description--if not the same course renumbered and renamed--Problems in Higher Rhetoric and Literary Criticism (UM Catalog 53). While Scott was teaching course 18, Advanced Composition, mentioned above, the Principles of Literary Criticism course, later taught by Demmon in English, first appeared (UM Catalog 1893-94, 66). All of these were upper-level courses, and some later became graduate courses, but the catalogs do not indicate whether they were limited at this point to graduate students. The descriptions suggest considerable overlap, nonetheless, in the critical interests of English and rhetoric.

Similar criticism courses appear in the journalism curriculum, but with an emphasis on professional practice that is absent in the English and rhetoric course

descriptions. In 1903-04 the rhetoric department lists course 12, Reviews, among those to be taken in the third year (UM Catalog 81-82). The course consists of "[e]ssays, lectures, and discussions," with an "aim . . . to furnish instruction, and give practice, in the writing of book-reviews. A few lectures on standards of criticism and methods of reviewing are given and specimen reviews are analyzed in detail" (UM Catalog 1904-05, 86). Rhetoric and journalism courses are intermixed at this point, and Reviews may have done double duty as a course for students interested in either area of study. With the element of reading model reviews and "practice" in a genre not exclusive to the academy ("book-reviews") the description resembles later journalism offerings. For example, course 34, Reviews, appears in 1916-17 under Journalism, with this vocationally oriented description: "A study of critical principles in their application to literature with emphasis upon the writing of reviews for periodicals and newspapers" (UM Catalog 191). The following year course 34 is renamed Criticism, with its description extended to include reviews of "painting, music, and the drama" in addition to literature (UM Catalog 1918-19, 196). In 1920-21, course 12, Book Reviews, is listed under Rhetoric, with no mention of models or preparing for professional practice. The description reads: "A study of critical principles, followed by discussions of selected works of contemporary literature" (UM Catalog 1920-21, 350). The journalism courses approach criticism as a matter of practicing professional genres found outside academe, whereas the rhetoric courses, like their counterparts in English, emphasize critical principles and canonical texts of academic study.

The differences in course descriptions suggest a line of reasoning by which the journalism curriculum acquired an identity distinct from rhetoric in spite of Scott's apparent desire to keep the two subjects together: Journalism was viewed and taught as a public or professional art practiced outside the academy, rhetoric as an area of academic study. This idea is not new, of course, but it was not a given for Scott, who wrote and spoke of journalism as one of many types of socially motivated rhetorical practice.

Furthermore it appears Scott was unaware of the extent to which his curriculum was bifurcated along this public-academic dividing line. Others have remarked on the contrast between Scott's innovative scholarship and his more conventional textbooks (Berlin, Rhetoric and Reality 49-50, Writing Instruction 81-82; Stewart and Stewart 131). The curriculum Scott directed seems similarly out of step with some of the ideas he expressed in his writings. At the same time, his writings reflect some of the limitations, common in his era, which recent critiques and revivals have overlooked in his work. Most significant are his adherence to a foundational epistemology that yields a limited view of rhetoric's inventional power and a liberal-cultural ideal that constrains rhetoric's ability to intervene in existing social orders. These failures of imagination were not Scott's alone. As shown in the next chapter, they were common features in the teaching of rhetoric as both speech and composition, and in the teaching and practice of journalism at the turn of the century.

Chapter 3: The Professionalization of Rhetoric and Journalism: Elements of a Shared History

INTRODUCTION

That rhetoric as an academic discipline does not routinely inform the practice of public discourse in addressing social and political concerns is by now a common lament among rhetoricians. For the last few decades, rhetoricians in the United States have worried over the unmooring of their subject, as a studied art, from the conduct of public affairs. Many inquiries into this issue--including those of Gregory Clark and S. Michael Halloran, Sharon Crowley, Nan Johnson, and Robert J. Connors, discussed in this chapter--focus on the teaching of rhetoric in the nineteenth century, because, as they point out, curricular changes during that century produced effects that survive even now. Changes in rhetorical education are just one part of the picture of what happened to public discourse over the nineteenth century, though. Clark and Halloran, in their introduction to Oratorical Culture in Nineteenth-Century America, depict changes in rhetorical education as occurring amid a larger transformation in American culture, an interpretation I support here and in previous chapters. Included in this transformation are the "emergence of the American university," as described by Laurence J. Veysey and discussed in the last chapter, and the professionalization of journalism, as seen in Michael Schudson's Discovering the News and The Good Citizen. These late nineteenth-century developments still influence the

teaching and practice of public discourse today.[1] This relevance is the primary reason for the nineteenth century's continuing interest to rhetoricians and journalists, and as I suggest, to communication scholars, political scientists, and others concerned with issues of democratic participation.

In this chapter I revisit the histories of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century rhetoric and journalism to provide further context for the discussion of Fred Newton Scott's academic work in the last chapter and the examination of Ida M. Tarbell's journalism presented in the next chapter. My aim is simultaneously critical and historical, as is my method. Criticizing and synthesizing arguments of historical studies such as those mentioned above, I interweave developments in rhetoric and journalism to provide a concise account that relates seemingly disparate areas of scholarship and concern in rhetoric and journalism. Sketching changes in the teaching of oral and written rhetoric, the practice of journalism, and the education of journalists, I judge the potential these developments offer for democratic participation. The key issue forming the basis for my criticism is the extent to which transformations in public discourse practices and teaching worked toward expanding or limiting participation in public deliberation and action.

While this critical-historical account falls squarely within historical traditions in rhetoric frequently tinged with nostalgia for rhetoric's presumed centrality in classical times to social and political life, I lend support to those

[1] In addition to those already mentioned, sources that make similar claims include, in rhetoric and English, Adams, Progressive Politics, Professional Writing; Berlin, Writing Instruction, Rhetoric and Reality; Graff; Stewart, "Rediscovering," "Two Model Teachers." In journalism, see Baldasty; W. Campbell; Gans; Mindich; Miraldi; Schiller.

traditions in part by interrogating the motives and consequences of the nostalgic stance. I doubt whether the practice of rhetoric, informed by classical traditions as read today in writings such as those of Plato, Aristotle, Quintilian, or Cicero, ever figured centrally in democratic politics understood as a process that seeks, indeed depends upon, the widest possible participation of constituents in public decision-making. My purpose in resurrecting past rhetorical practices undertaken as "rhetoric" or "journalism" is neither to reinstate nor condemn those practices, but to inform current ones. Specifically I intend to make a case for reviving the technē tradition as explicated by Janet M. Atwill to inform current practices in American rhetoric and journalism, even as I present an account that denies this tradition a significant role in nineteenth-century education.

From this anti-nostalgic, critical-historical perspective, I take issue with scholars whose aims I generally support. S. Michael Halloran and his co-authors, for example, provide compelling evidence of what Halloran calls the "decline of public discourse" in rhetorical teaching in American colleges during the nineteenth century (Clark and Halloran; Wright and Halloran; Halloran, "Rhetoric"). As Atwill shows, however, public discourse traditions in rhetoric are not of a piece. Atwill's distinction between humanist and technē traditions illuminates the cultural conservatism implied in Halloran's arguments and those arguments' potential, if carried to their ends, to stifle democratic processes. In short, Halloran and colleagues gesture toward democratic purposes by advocating the revival of public-oriented rhetoric, but because they fail to suggest a replacement for humanist traditions, their arguments do not lead toward

democratic ends. Specifying the technē tradition as antidote to rhetoric's separation from public discourse practices completes the democratic trajectory of their arguments. At the same time, combining histories of journalism with those of rhetoric supports the suggestion of Halloran and others that rhetoric's drift from public concerns had significant consequences for democratic politics in the United States.[2]

In two main sections treating rhetoric and journalism, this chapter provides a historical sketch and critique of American rhetorical practices in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Drawing from Burton J. Bledstein's characterization of a "culture of professionalism" that developed in the nineteenth century,[3] I argue that movements toward professionalism in rhetoric and journalism significantly constrained the teaching and use of rhetoric as a democratic power at the turn of the twentieth century in America. Professionalism within the academy reflected research, liberal-culture, and utility aims as outlined by Laurence R. Veysey. Rhetoric, as an academic subject, reflected these aims as well. In a parallel development, journalism also professionalized on the basis of expertise perceived as scientific and literary or cultural. While journalism curricula often grew out of English and rhetoric departments, journalism quickly distinguished itself as a publicly oriented

[2] Acknowledging Nan Johnson's point that this perceived drift may be viewed more constructively as an "expansion" of rhetoric's concerns, I use a middle term, "diversification." With its capitalist connotation acquired in connection with investments, as well as the social-cultural connotation of "diversity," I intend for this term to encompass the commercial, private as well as political, public purposes rhetorical education embraced by the end of the century.

[3] In this use of Bledstein's work, I follow Clark and Halloran.

professional subject, separate from the academic and literary concerns that characterized rhetoric. These movements toward professionalism inside and outside the academy effectively converged to restrict the impact rhetoric as a citizens' art could exert in public life.

RHETORICAL EDUCATION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Overview

As the nineteenth-century college curriculum adapted to changing educational needs and demands of the populace, rhetoric, viewed as the central art of aristocratic leadership, made way for professional expertise, considered central to meritocratic achievement. Some scholars argue that the older tradition of education was public-oriented but elitist, the newer one individualistic but more widely accessible (Wright and Halloran, Clark and Halloran). Neither tradition, though, was democratic in the sense of preparing increasing portions of the populace to participate effectively in self-government. In the historical overview I present here, rhetorical instruction diversified into specialties over the nineteenth century, as did the college curriculum. While taking into consideration the relationships between oral and written practices of rhetoric in the overview, I emphasize the trajectory of written rhetoric because of its direct relationship to the formation of journalism studies. Likewise, I sketch very briefly some of concurrent activities outside of college in which people acquired and practiced rhetorical skill, while devoting more attention, in the second main section of the chapter, to the extracurricular rhetoric of professional journalism.

Briefly recounting developments in rhetoric and then offering judgments on their implications, I suggest that if the nineteenth-century transformation of rhetorical education disappoints today's scholars in its distancing of rhetoric from public affairs, an important reason may be that the transformation did not involve a very great shift in motive. In referring to "motive," I follow Halloran and Gregory Clark in their characterization of the changes in rhetoric over the nineteenth century as a Burkean transformation (Clark and Halloran, "Introduction" 3-4, 10). Like the essays collected in their Oratorical Culture, this study attempts to avoid teleological explanations in favor of examining the ambiguities of motive, as Burke advises (Clark and Halloran, "Introduction" 3, 25-26; Burke, Grammar 994). The idea that rhetoric began and ended the nineteenth century as an art upholding elitist cultures is not altogether new; several works suggest as much (Crowley, Composition; Graff; Clark and Halloran; Wright and Halloran). However, examining the transformation of nineteenth-century rhetoric in terms of humanist versus technē traditions provides further insight into relatively stable motives of new and old cultures and practices. This analysis points toward ways in which we might promote rhetoric's potential as a democratic art in the present century.

Rhetorical instruction devised in the late nineteenth century to serve the newly specialized system of higher education--and passed down to succeeding generations along with that system--reflected the diverse aims of utility, research, liberal culture, and combinations thereof, described by Veysey and discussed in chapter two. Despite this diversity of aims and approaches, rhetoric and higher

education in general shared a broad purpose of educating an upwardly striving middle class in an assumed meritocracy. The new system of higher education was similar to the old college tradition it replaced, in its culture-preserving motive; what changed was the culture being sustained. The civic culture of the early nineteenth century gave way to what Bledstein calls a "culture of professionalism" beginning mid-century.

In Burkean terms, rhetorical education practices throughout the nineteenth century continued to be "grounded" by a "motivating principle" of acculturating students, even as the acknowledged purposes of education--the cultures for which students were prepared--changed from civic to professional. Education for either culture was more a matter of preparing students to find places within existing social structures than preparing students to challenge or reinvent those structures. A humanist tradition of rhetoric, which serves a normalizing social function by imparting accepted values (Atwill 18, 29-30), suited the purpose in each case. Students in the nineteenth century were to acquire subjectivities that would fit them for their social roles--subjectivities based on certain kinds or bodies of knowledge, whether conceived in terms of "culture" or "expertise" or a combination of the two.

Historical evidence presented in this chapter indicates that the technē tradition of rhetoric, which Atwill shows to be more compatible with democracy,[4] was largely dormant in mainstream higher education during the nineteenth century. The most likely reasons for the prevalence of humanism over the technē

[4] Rhetoric Reclaimed as a whole makes this argument; see especially Atwill's concluding remarks (207-12).

tradition lie in the latter's interventionist force. As Atwill explains, a techne is an art of "invention and intervention." Rhetoric as technē enables citizens to seize "advantage," offering the possibility of "overreaching" the boundaries of their current status (20, 27, 45). Although rhetoric as technē can be used to secure as well as disrupt order, two aspects of technē especially threaten existing authority. One is mētis, or "cunning intelligence," which enables a rhetor (or practitioner of any technē) to outwit a more powerful opponent (Atwill 55-56). Kairos, or moment, is another intimidating aspect of technē; awareness of the opportune moment is crucial to successful intervention (Atwill 57-60). The seizing of advantage, which Atwill finds common across uses of technē in ancient Greece, is the aspect of rhetoric that Fred Newton Scott disparaged as an ignoble striving for "success" ("Two Ideals," "Rhetoric Rediviva").[5] This potential for disruption, which gives the technē tradition of rhetoric its democratic power, also helps explain why the tradition has long garnered special distrust among those in positions of authority.[6]

Rhetoric as technē would have been particularly suspect, then, in the university structure that Veysey describes as having "crystallized" by the first

[5] Scott presents this critique with some humor in "Rhetoric Rediviva," proposing that Korax's rhetorical teachings "might have borne the title 'Every man his own pettifogger'" (414). Scott describes Aristotle's Rhetoric as an elaboration on Korax's tradition (414).

[6] Similarly, if one views journalism as rhetoric practiced in the technē tradition, as I suggest in chapter one and illustrate further in chapter four, this element helps explain, too, how journalism has often been effective in cultivating a potential for antagonism as "watchdog" over powerful orders in politics and business.

decade of the twentieth century (338-41). Rhetoric's association at the end of the century with a required course serving the college or university as a whole aligned it with the aims of administrators, whose positions, as Veysey points out, demanded increasing conservatism as institutional patterns became established (342-45, 362-65).[7] Focusing on the entry-level writing course, composition-rhetoric acquired a "monitoring" and "disciplining" function in higher education, providing training in the writing and thinking characteristic of "the good student" (Crowley, Composition 8-9, 30-45). Adams argues that while the curriculum of written rhetoric performed this function at the introductory levels, advanced courses in such specialties as journalism, creative writing, and public relations provided more sophisticated instruction for a select group of students. Oratorical instruction at the end of the century emphasized the performative aspects of elocution, taught through reading and recitation of existing texts rather than the invention of new ones (Cohen 1-12). Adams argues that the newly professionalized writing curriculum effectively educated classes of haves and have-nots, in terms of rhetorical sophistication (Progressive Politics 1-20, 145-50); Cohen's study indicates that the curriculum in oral rhetoric did nothing to mitigate this effect.

To the extent that nineteenth- and early twentieth-century rhetoricians embraced humanist traditions, they worked against dynamic social forces inside

[7] Bledstein makes similar observations on the "conservative consequences" of professionalization in higher education (92-94). See also my discussion, in chapter two, of James Burrill Angell's conservative-democratic views.

and outside the academy; the more they viewed rhetoric as a stabilizing force, the more rhetoricians prevented their discipline from effecting democratic change in education and public rhetorical practice. Composition-rhetoric, from which journalism instruction originated, followed humanist traditions and became a reactionary enterprise, while rhetoric practiced outside the discipline and academy, in some instances, became a powerful tool of change, a social dynamis beyond rhetoricians' reach. Progressive-era muckraking, as I argue later in the journalism section, represents one of those instances, as journalists effectively devised a rhetorical technē with which they intervened in the political status quo to invent new possibilities for the publics they served.

Rhetoric in College

Examining nineteenth-century rhetorical teaching in the United States from various perspectives, historians tell of a pronounced change from a fairly homogeneous oral, neoclassical curriculum at the beginning of the century to a diverse range of approaches to teaching writing, reading, and speaking in English at the century's end. Rhetorical education adapted, along with higher education as a whole, to demands of a rapidly expanding, increasingly industrialized nation (Berlin, Writing Instruction; Clark and Halloran; Connors; Graff; Wright and Halloran).

At the beginning of the century, a handful of small Eastern colleges trained an elite class of young white men to assume civic leadership. College attendance was extremely limited, comprising less than two percent of eligible men (Graff 50). Numbers of graduates from thirty-seven "leading colleges"

averaged only around four or five hundred annually from 1820 to 1840 (Bledstein 241). Colleges used a tutorial system, in which the college president and a few other faculty members presented weekly lectures, and tutors led small daily recitation sections, ideally supplementing the lectures, but in reality often unrelated to them (Bledstein 243). In a recitation, students would read aloud, scan, translate, transcribe, and often literally recite passages from Greek or Latin orations and other works, or from English textbooks (Graff 28-35; Bledstein 238-43). Tutors, like the more experienced faculty, were generalists who taught most subjects covered at the college (Clark and Halloran 18). Yale president William Graham Sumner remarked in 1870 that there was "'no such thing yet at Yale as an academical career. There is no course marked out for a man who feels called to this work. . .'" (qtd. in Veysey 6). Bledstein explains this comment in terms of an "academic culture" in which college teaching was not a distinct vocation, but rather, it was an occupation one drifted into or out of on the way from or to another pursuit (269).

In colleges of this era, oral rhetoric was recognized as the focal point of the liberal arts curriculum. Oratory was the means of learning and displaying knowledge in class, it received much attention out of class in debate and literary societies, and it was the capstone art that enabled graduates to put their knowledge to use in public arenas (Connors 8-10; Graff 19-51; Hochmuth and Murphy; Wright and Halloran). Dividing the century into quarters, Marie Hochmuth and Richard Murphy characterize the rhetorical curriculum of 1800 to 1825 as a continuation of late- and post-Colonial practices, with heavy reliance on

declamation and disputation, oral arguments on deliberative or forensic questions.[8] Whereas the earliest Colonial college students had learned a "truncated," Ramistic rhetoric of style and delivery (Howell, "English Backgrounds" 28-40), during and after the Revolution, interest in classical rhetoric resurfaced as colonists debated questions of war and self-government (Hochmuth and Murphy 154). Books and paper were expensive and pens cumbersome, and oratorical exercises served as means of learning and rehearsing lessons from readings, much as note-taking, papers, and written examinations do today (Wright and Halloran 226). Consistent with a neoclassical understanding of

[8] Historical accounts indicate that declamation and disputation generally denoted deliberative and forensic exercises, respectively, in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century American pedagogy. Both exercises seem to have derived from the Roman practice of declamatio. Declamation in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century practice was an oral version of what we would call a theme or school essay, with the important exception that it usually had a wider audience; a declamation was a "practice" or "fictional" speech using an assigned topic or organizing principle. This practice appears generally quite similar to the Roman idea of declamation. Because Roman declamation involved the complete art of rhetoric as did speeches in public forums, James J. Murphy describes it as "the cap, the culmination" of the twelve-step progymnasmata process ("Key Role" 69).

Nineteenth-century disputation combines elements found in both Roman declamation and Medieval disputatio. Roman declamations were of two types, suasoria and controversia, aimed at giving practice in deliberative and forensic speech-making, respectively (Murphy, "Key Role" 69). While eighteenth- and nineteenth-century declamation and disputation refer to something like these two former genres of Roman declamation, disputation also resembles the medieval practice of disputatio, an exercise in debating opposing sides of a question (Murphy, Middle Ages 102-04). Murphy notes that Medieval disputatio, though similar to the rhetorical controversia, originated in the teaching of dialectic rather than rhetoric (Middle Ages 104-06). While declamation later yielded to theme-writing (Graff 44), disputation developed into extracurricular competitive debating or forensics (Hochmuth and Murphy 169-70), in developments I sketch further below.

rhetoric as the art central to political and religious leadership, rhetorical study and practice suffused the college experience.

Hochmuth and Murphy note two significant "expansions" of rhetorical instruction in the first quarter-century: the establishment of rhetoric chairs, "giving to the field a status in the curriculum" (Hochmuth and Murphy 160), and the introduction of literary concerns of "perspicuity and perspicaciousness" (160). Both developments, illustrated in Ronald F. Reid's study of the first five occupants of the Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory, proved significant for rhetoric as the century progressed. Harvard's establishment of the Boylston chair, the country's first such position in rhetoric, was part of the larger movement to specialize college teaching. As Reid explains, when Ward Nicholas Boylston endowed the position in 1771, "the system of class tutors" was giving way to "one in which each tutor specialized in an academic field" (239). An endowed chair represented the combined commitment of an educational institution and an individual or group outside it (i.e., the donor[s]), to support the teaching of a specific subject. Reid traces the mutation of rhetoric at Harvard from a program of classical oratory, under John Quincy Adams' professorship, from 1806 to 1809, to a writing-centered curriculum with "little direct reference to classical authors" under Adams Sherman Hill, from 1876 to 1904 (239). Accompanying this shift in focus was the development of the English department at Harvard, which became the academic home of the Boylston chair. The history of this position over the nineteenth century reflects on one hand the movement in higher education in which departments replaced endowed chairs as the custodians

of specialties. It illustrates on the other hand a discipline specific change in which rhetoric expanded and divided into sub-areas, one of which (English) grew to subsume the sub-area called "rhetoric" or "composition."

Curricular change had begun early in the life of the new republic, when colleges were called upon to provide better speaking and writing skills, as much for the benefit of an inarticulate upper class as for a new class of lesser prepared students (Hochmuth and Murphy). James A. Berlin adds that Americans aspired to a literature of their own, distinct from that of England (Writing Instruction 25). The oral-neoclassical rhetoric of liberal arts colleges divided into three specialties around mid-century: "rhetoric," emphasizing writing and the study of literary models; "oratory," dealing with speaking and the oral interpretation of canonical orations; and "elocution," focusing on delivery skills. Forensic disputation, a common practice in the oral curriculum, found a place in the extracurricular activity of debating. Late in the century and into the next, rhetoric (the written branch) divided into literature and composition, and oratory started to be called "public speaking," as it acquired some practical-skills elements of elocution instruction (Hochmuth and Murphy).

By century's end higher education in general had reorganized around an array of specialized, elective curricula, to accommodate students from a wider segment of society--though still predominantly white men--seeking preparation for a variety of careers. Conceptions within academe and demands from outside it had conspired to transform finishing schools for an aristocracy into training grounds for a perceived meritocracy. Rhetoric's diversification was part of this

change (Adams, A History, Progressive Politics; Clark and Halloran, Oratorical Culture; Connors; Graff; Halloran; Johnson; Wright and Halloran). At the end of the century, and continuing into the first decades of the twentieth century, advanced composition produced separate specialties, including journalism (Adams, A History, Progressive Politics; Russell), discussed later in this chapter.

Texts and Precedents

The most popular texts in the early nineteenth century were imported from Scotland: Hugh Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres and George Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric. As Nan Johnson remarks, these works "enjoyed unchallenged dominion over the theoretical orientation" of North American rhetoric in the first half of the century. Richard Whately's Elements of Rhetoric gained comparable acceptance in colleges by the 1840s (Johnson 65). In turn, these texts provided theoretical and pedagogical foundations for American rhetorics written and used in the latter half of the century (Johnson).

Combining classical ideas of rhetoric's social functions as an art of public discourse with a scientific understanding of communication rooted in faculty psychology, the works of Blair, Campbell, and Whately represented a tradition Wilbur Samuel Howell called the "New Rhetoric" of late eighteenth-century Britain (Eighteenth-Century 5-6, qtd. in Johnson 19, 261 n1). Self-consciously fashioned in opposition to the classical training in Latin and Greek offered at exclusive Anglican universities, the New Rhetoric seemed ready-made for higher education in the newly independent republic across the Atlantic (Berlin, Writing Instruction 32-34; Ferreira-Buckley and Horner; Miller). As Johnson observes,

the New Rhetoric was practically synonymous with American college education in an era characterized by dual educational aims of instilling mental discipline and piety in society's future leaders (243-44; see also Veysey 21-28).[9]

The principles comprising this influential tradition derive from its classical attention to contexts of discourse, its epistemological basis in science of the mental faculties, and its belletristic concern with developing the specific faculty of taste (Johnson 19-20). Following the New Rhetoric, nineteenth-century theorists define rhetoric as an art of adapting discourses to their aims, understood in terms of faculty-based categories: "to enlighten the understanding, please the imagination, move the passions, [or] influence the will" (62). Johnson finds that nineteenth-century theory expands on the classical divisions or forums of rhetoric--deliberative, forensic, and epideictic or the post-classical homiletic--to posit two broad categories, oratory and composition. Together these categories encompass nearly all types of written and spoken discourse, from political speeches to poetry, sermons to personal letters (62). Four of the classical canons appear, with New Rhetorical interpretations: invention, understood as the "selection and

[9] Suggesting that mental discipline remained the key element of education even at research-oriented institutions like Johns Hopkins at the end of the century, Johnson differs with Veysey, who claims it "collapsed" (Johnson 244, Veysey 50-56). However, Veysey avers that "mental discipline did not die a neat death"; elements of it remained in curricula in the last decades of the century (54-55). Veysey casts liberal culture as the closest of the new aims to the older mental discipline (194-97), but he also finds traces of mental discipline mingled with utility (100-104) and research (141). Johnson's emphasis on the relative stability of rhetorical perspectives over the century provides a useful counterpoint to Veysey's focus on divergent aims; together they highlight the extent to which rhetorical traditions serving old and new institutions could embody similar culture-preserving impulses, as I argue below.

management of proofs" directed toward particular faculties; arrangement, or the "conduct" of a discourse; style, including grammar, "perspicuity in diction," sentence structure and arrangement, and aesthetic and emotional elements such as "vivacity" and "beauty" achieved through figures and tropes; and delivery, "management of the voice . . ., gesture and expression" (62-63). Johnson finds these features consistent throughout nineteenth-century texts.

The pedagogical practices referred to as "current-traditional" rhetoric appeared in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Robert C. Connors provides a succinct history of this problematic term, and argues for its discontinuance (4-7). Current-traditional rhetoric, he points out, does not so much describe a deliberate tradition as a variable collection of reviled practices. Recognizing the limitations of the term, I follow Crowley and Berlin in using it, as I discuss their works below, precisely because of the meaning they impart to "current-traditional" pedagogy in their opposition to it. Connors concedes that rhetoricians most often use the term "to describe the reactionary and derivative nature of the textbook tradition" (5), which is how I interpret Crowley's and Berlin's usage of "current-traditional." This "textbook tradition" includes not only the texts themselves but also teaching that followed them very closely, even slavishly, adding little in the way of background theory. As Connors points out, this tradition arose in response to teaching conditions at the turn of the century; composition-rhetoric suffered a shortage of experienced teachers, as first-year writing became a universal requirement at the same time that enrollments soared (100). All rhetoric textbooks need not be impugned with the term "current-

traditional," however. Rather, "current-traditional" most often denotes the treatment of writing instruction as a matter of imparting a set of acontextual rules in a prescriptive manner, without regard to audience or other aspects of the rhetorical situation. In this approach, the process of invention is treated as "method," as Crowley argues (Methodical Memory).

The textbook tradition introduced in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries featured genres of instructional texts still used today. Rhetorics, the primary textbooks, began as adaptations from the treatises popular earlier in the century, becoming increasingly practical and less theoretical (Connors 84, 86); in their current-traditional form, they present seemingly irrefutable instructions (Berlin, Writing Instruction 71). Rhetorics provide "lessons, illustrations, and practical exercises," covering "levels of composition (word, sentence, paragraph, whole composition," "modes of discourse (narration, description, exposition, argument)," and other features such as style, mechanics, grammar, and instructions in outlining (Connors 86). Handbooks, a late nineteenth-century invention, represented a new kind of reference tailored for the "textbook tradition" of teaching. Connors credits Edwin C. Woolley's Handbook of Composition: A Compendium of Rules (1907) with introducing "[t]he idea that a textbook could or should be built completely around correcting deficiencies" (92). Readers, anthologies of models for students to emulate, had existed in neoclassical pedagogy, in the form of compilations of canonical orations. At the turn of the century, readers conformed to the types of composition students were

being asked to write; separate collections devoted to each of the four modes of discourse began to appear (Connors 87).

Interpretations and Implications

Several versions of nineteenth-century composition-rhetoric history variously depict a classically informed curriculum as falling victim to the rise of science (Berlin, Writing Instruction), humanism (Crowley, Composition), or professionalism (Clark and Halloran, Halloran, Wright and Halloran). Alternatively, rhetoric is seen as expanding over the century to fit changing times (Connors, Johnson). Each of these assessments captures significant elements of change in rhetorical instruction over the century. Contradictions among these historical interpretations occur largely in the aspects of change or stability they emphasize in comparing curricula at the beginning and end of the century. Johnson notes, for example, that rhetoricians' disagreements over whether classical rhetoric experienced a "demise" often have to do with perspective (12). To those who take a "classicist stance," as Berlin does in Writing Instruction, or who show a "specialization or praxis bias," as Halloran and colleagues tend to do in emphasizing the classical forums of public discourse, any departure from the original model pales in comparison (Johnson 12). Comparing these diverse perspectives and reading them alongside Veysey's account of the university's emergence reveals a set of coherent narrative elements. The roles of science, humanism, and professionalism in the formation of new rhetorical curricula correspond to the emergence of research, liberal culture, and utility as newly espoused aims in higher education in the last few decades of the century.

As Veysey argues, no one aim prevailed exclusively in higher education. Utility, first to challenge the piety and discipline aims imported from Europe and England, represented an approach perceived as peculiarly American and set a precedent for other reforms to follow or oppose (2-3, 57-61). Aims often overlapped or converged, though, and after a period of experimentation, they blended together considerably. Similarly, it would be a mistake to attribute changes in rhetoric solely or even primarily to influences of science, humanism, or professionalism. Rather, each of these impulses had a part in reshaping rhetorical instruction--although I submit that professionalism can be construed, in what I call an imposed sense, as inscribing the other two impulses. Not only was there a good deal of coherence or consolidation in the new, diverse rhetorical curricula at century's end, but rhetorical teaching also contained relatively stable features throughout the century (Connors 11-12, Johnson). A stable motive of imparting culture, which underlay shifting purposes related to civic or professional ideals, explains how rhetoric could simultaneously change dramatically and remain at some level essentially the same over the course of the century.

Professionalism occurs in this analysis in two functional senses, indigenous and imposed. The distinction hinges on whether people used the term in reference to themselves or their aims, or whether it is used to describe them from a distance.[10] Veysey uses professionalism in the indigenous sense in

[10] Both uses of "professional" or "professionalism," for the purposes of this study, reflect an attitude toward a field of work, based on qualitative perceptions of the work, especially its value to society and the level of expertise it entails. This general, qualitative view contrasts with a sociological concept of

discussing the utility aim in education. Proponents of utility generally accepted the association of higher education with "professionalism." They embraced professionalism in their provision of vocational instruction in areas such as engineering, agriculture, home economics, journalism, and even in the liberal arts, which some saw as providing necessary balance to professional training (Veysey 67-68, 100-103). To the utility-minded educator, "professional" denoted expertise of value to society, in virtually any field (Veysey 71).

In Bledstein's work, professionalism often occurs as an indigenous term, but more significantly it serves overall as an imposed term, describing a concept the author locates as a key motivating factor in major social change over the nineteenth century. Bledstein argues that the middle class, a fluid social category with which many Americans came to identify, is largely a nineteenth-century development. Founded upon a belief in upward mobility--the perception that individuals can improve their material and social circumstances through effort--the notion of a middle class emerged along with a "culture of professionalism." This culture valued competence and specialized knowledge based on theoretical or scientific principles, and the American university developed as chief supplier of that knowledge. The university established its authority and secured its place

---

"professional," associated with a set of formal criteria, including, for example, competency tests and enforced adherence to codes of conduct, by which a field is deemed a "profession." As Barbie Zelizer points out, in arguing for a consideration of journalists as members of "interpretive communities" rather than as "professionals," journalists do not conform consistently to sociologists' standards of professionalism (403). They do claim professional attributes, as she observes (402-3); it is this impulse toward professionalism I wish to emphasize.

in American society by providing various kinds of professional competence the middle class demanded.[11]

Bledstein describes the culture of professionalism as embodying a democratic idealism that was at once radical and conservative. The radical element of professionalism lay in the autonomy a person gained through expertise alone; a professional was a "self-governing individual exercising his trained judgment in an open society" (Bledstein 87).[12] By virtue of expertise, one could exercise authority over others of ostensibly higher social standing. Americans assumed "[s]cience as a source for professional authority transcended . . . politics, . . . personality, . . . and partisanship" (90). The flip side of this supposedly nonpartisan expertise was that "[p]rofessionals controlled the magic circle of scientific knowledge which only the few, specialized by training and indoctrination, were privileged to enter, but which all in the name of nature's universality were obliged to appreciate" (90). The very real limits on upward mobility (limited access to schooling, for example, especially for women, African Americans, and the poor, throughout much of the century) were thus just one part of professionalism's conservative side. Professional expertise itself endowed

---

[11] Bledstein's work complements Veysey's, further illuminating the context in which American universities developed. Whereas Veysey's book concentrates on university history, Bledstein's is more of a social history culminating in the institutionalization of professionalism within higher education. Bledstein occasionally draws from Veysey, and his account accords with Veysey's argument that the university developed as an institution distinct from the traditional college by asserting itself as a utilitarian force.

[12] Bledstein's work, characteristic of its era, uses male pronouns in non-gender-specific situations; however, there is little doubt that "professionals" were presumed male in the nineteenth century.

certain individuals with a type of privilege fallaciously credited with transcending class, race, gender, religion, or ethnicity. As Bledstein argues, by the end of the nineteenth century a professional class had established itself as an elite authority in the United States. Technically not closed to specific persons by birth, as was European aristocracy, the American elite was nevertheless powerfully exclusive.

Higher education served to legitimate this elite's authority, providing both knowledge and credentials, manifested in increasingly specialized degrees with their peculiar requirements and exams. Democracy required "persuasive symbols" of authority, which a "majority of people could reliably believe just and warranted" (Bledstein 123). Higher education assumed this function "by appealing to the universality and objectivity of 'science'" (Bledstein 124). Regulatory mechanisms proliferated outside academe as well. Professional societies abounded in the 1880s, devoted to specialized fields of knowledge as diverse as folklore, ornithology, and climatology (Bledstein 86). (Amid this frenzy of professionalization, the Modern Language Association formed in 1883.) Even as professional culture offered many people new opportunities to improve their situations, American society became increasingly "dependent" on--and intimidated by--professional expertise (Bledstein 99). The existence of professionals presupposed the existence of somewhat hapless "clients," who were paradoxically "by definition unworthy of [the professional's] attention" (Bledstein 102). Professionalism served as a basis of a "a new, more intense and more discriminating democracy" in place of the egalitarian ideal popularized in the Jacksonian era (Bledstein 117). Echoing Veysey's comments on the conservative

democratic leanings of university administrators, Bledstein notes that presidents such as Harvard's Charles W. Eliot often revealed that to them, "[d]emocracy . . . meant rule by merit--never equality" (Bledstein 322-23). By the end of the century, Americans had established a meritocracy of professionals, authorized primarily by newly departmentalized universities and colleges.

Professionalism, in an imposed sense, was a common impulse motivating not only the utility aim in higher education but also those of research and liberal culture. Although proponents of the latter two aims did not use "professional" to describe their positions--and in fact positioned themselves against this idea, in utilitarian or vocational terms--they strove for their own versions of exclusionary professional competence. Bledstein's observation that the PhD became "a vocational degree" in the United States supports this idea; the doctorate served as a third level of professional education (298). The research aim in education, which Veysey also calls "pure research," emphasized the pursuit of specialized knowledge through scientific methods; this knowledge was so privileged as to qualify as its own end (121-25). Research-minded educators expressed professional ideals in terms of rigorous scholarship. Professionals in this school of thought were "researchers," "scholars," or "scientists." Liberal-culture proponents emphasized the pursuit of aesthetic and moral sensibilities associated with humanism; they expressed their professional ideal in terms of the "educated" person, someone "well-read" and hence "cultured." Familiarization with canonical texts also encouraged this person to be of "sound morals" (Veysey 184-91). Professionalism thus served as a common motive in divergent aims of higher

education at the end of the century. Within universities, academics effectively professionalized according to rationales of utility, research, and liberal culture.

Science

In Writing Instruction in the Nineteenth Century, Berlin casts "scientistic" thinking as the key factor that redefined education and rhetoric over the century. He presents first the "demise of the classical tradition" in favor of eighteenth-century New Rhetoric (13-34), then the rise of the New Rhetoric's "American imitators," who produced current-traditional rhetoric (35-41, 58-76). Their ideas defeated a simultaneous alternative--a romantic rhetoric based on Emersonian philosophy (42-57). In Berlin's view, both the elective system and the division of rhetoric into separate branches of oratory, literature, and composition reflect the influence of faculty psychology. Electives effectively "divided the entire academic community into discrete parts" devoted to different types of intellectual endeavors, "leading to an assembly-line conception of education" (Berlin, Writing Instruction 9). Rhetoric, he avers, also divided into specialties corresponding to separate faculties: Persuasive discourse went to oratory; imaginative discourse to literature; exposition and argument to composition (9, 63). Beyond the drama of triumph and defeat in this account, Berlin provides a useful, brief analysis of the science-like thinking that informed nineteenth-century rhetoric. First a few qualifications are in order, though.

Clark and Halloran question the timing in this account, pointing out that faculty psychology was passé by the time electives and current-traditional rhetoric appeared (20). Using Bledstein's work, they suggest further that the "scientific

spirit" was one of many factors leading to the changes in rhetoric and in education (20). Not all argument went to composition, either, I would add; as mentioned earlier, forensic argument found a home in extracurricular debating (Hochmuth and Murphy). However, while Berlin overstates the causal effects of faculty psychology on disciplinary divisions,[13] in identifying the allure of science as crucial to these developments, he highlights a feature of professionalism that affected rhetorical practices inside and outside the academy. Furthermore he suggests a link between science and commerce that accords with Bledstein's description of professionalism and with Clark and Halloran's analysis of the role professional culture played in rhetoric's transformation.

While faculty psychology per se was outmoded by the time the current-traditional textbooks appeared, the foundational epistemology that lent this theory its force as a presumed predictor of human behavior remained intact. Nineteenth-century rhetoricians believed writing and its pedagogy to be governed by scientific principles of human nature and, late in the century, principles of social behavior (Berlin, Writing Instruction; Johnson). Even Fred Newton Scott, who challenged aspects of current-traditionalism and other Eastern approaches, believed that the scientific study of rhetoric could reveal foundational principles of human language use (Scott, "Rhetoric Rediviva"). With this understanding, and faced with growing numbers of students taught by inexperienced instructors, rhetoricians devised increasingly methodical pedagogy imitating the methods of

[13] Others have criticized similar overgeneralizations in Berlin's work (Crowley, Composition; Johnson). See also my critique in chapter two of his characterization of Scott's work.

scientific investigation (Connors; Crowley, Methodical Memory). Rhetorical theory all but disappeared from the later texts, so that the aims of discourse inherited from the New Rhetoric were present only in the form of "modes," without evidence of the faculty-psychology rationale (Berlin, Writing Instruction). Epistemologically, current-traditional rhetoric remained scientistic, as Berlin maintains, even if faculty psychology was no longer its explicit rationale. Berlin summarizes, "Encouraged by the business community, with the tacit approval of science departments, composition courses became positivistic in spirit and method" (9). The scientistic cachet commended composition-rhetoric as a practical skill in business as well as academe.

Humanism

Crowley argues conversely, in Composition in the University, that this very presumption of universal value derives from composition's association with the humanist literary traditions long upheld in English departments. Like Berlin, she presents an account of rhetoric's demise (30-45), but at the hands of humanists rather than science enthusiasts. Maintaining that rhetoric had "disappeared altogether from college and university curricula" by the last decades of the century (33), Crowley refuses the name "rhetoric" to writing instruction from that point until rhetoric's revival mid-twentieth century (59).[14] Her

[14] "Since then," Crowley adds, "the practice of rhetoric in America has not been connected in any systematic way with education in its principles" (Composition 33). Likewise, Johnson proclaims the nineteenth century "the last era during which the discipline of rhetoric exerted an acknowledged authority" over the study and teaching of "oral and written communication" (3). My thesis for this section can be read as yet another version of the claim: "Composition-rhetoric as a discipline, following humanist traditions, became a reactionary

interpretation of history is like that of Donald C. Stewart's "Harvardization" theory ("Two Model Teachers," discussed in the previous chapter), in its depiction of literature as gaining disciplinary stature at composition-rhetoric's expense.[15] But Crowley extends this argument to explore in depth the humanist character that literature conferred on composition during the formation of English as a discipline. In her view, "Humanism is the common thread that has historically tied literary study to composition" (21). It is humanism, too, that suited composition to the role of acculturating students (30-78).

Crowley counters Berlin's claim that scientism gave composition its appeal to growing technological interests in universities and business, pointing out that current-traditional pedagogy was developed by humanists, not scientists and engineers. "It makes more sense to look for humanist impulses in current-traditional pedagogy," she says, "and such impulses are not hard to find" (94). The focus of current-traditional textbooks on diction and grammar, for example, belies the authors' concern with correcting telltale faults that might identify

---

enterprise, while rhetoric practiced outside the discipline and academy, became a powerful tool of change, a social dynamis beyond rhetoricians' reach." Whereas Crowley focuses on the literature-composition dynamic and Johnson seeks to rehabilitate nineteenth-century rhetoric from its previously maligned state in scholarship, though, I seek to illuminate the absence of rhetoric as technē from nineteenth-century teaching.

[15] Others take similar positions, Crowley notes (11-12): for example, James A. Berlin in Rhetoric and Reality and Susan Miller in Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition (Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 1990) and in "Composition as a Cultural Artifact: Rethinking History as Theory," Writing Theory and Critical Theory, ed. John Clifford and John Schilb, 19-32 (New York: MLA, 1994). Kitzhaber's Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900 is in this vein also.

students as "less well bred" or uneducated--i.e., nonmembers of the class they aspire to join by way of college (95-96). In her historical account Crowley points out that composition, with its premise that much of what makes for good writing could be learned, threatened the aesthetic mystique that made literature a promising subject for advanced study. Even so, she argues, to a considerable extent composition subsidized literature's development as a discipline via the universal requirement of freshman writing (19-97). Admitting to some overstatement, she claims basically that without composition, literature would not exist (59). The primal link between these two branches of English studies was the concept of taste, in Crowley's view a civic ideal turned bourgeois class marker (30-45).

Taste as codified in current-traditional pedagogy descended from--in both ancestral and inferior senses, for Crowley--the ideal expounded in Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. Starting with a deceptively simple definition, "the power of receiving pleasure from the beauties of nature and art" (Lectures 37), Blair elaborates a theory and pedagogy of taste that places it at the center of public discourse. As Johnson explains, "In the Lectures Blair popularizes the assumption that there is a cause-and-effect relationship between the cultivation of taste (through the study and practice of rhetoric) and the acquisition of intellectual, moral, and civil virtue" (45; also qtd. in Crowley, Composition 37). Crowley holds that American nineteenth-century rhetorics effectively discarded the civic rationale, turning taste into a "rather mechanical theory of human response," a faculty that enables one to recognize the aesthetic

qualities of good writing (37). Examining nineteenth-century texts, she finds American authors further associated taste with the culture of an educated class. Taste, they professed, was a quality that educated persons exhibited in their judgment; by learning to exercise taste, one acquired a crucial characteristic of educated culture. In a move Atwill finds frequent among definitions of humanism (24), American rhetoricians used this type of circular reasoning to "universalize" the definition of taste as a humanist characteristic, "naturaliz[ing] that which [was] culturally instituted" (Crowley, Composition 41, 43). Crowley concludes that latter nineteenth-century American rhetoricians transformed Blair's idea of taste, which represented an extension of Quintilian's vir bonus doctrine, into a prescription for the "genteel man of taste" (36).

Johnson's and Crowley's interpretations of latter nineteenth-century texts differ, leading them to considerably different conclusions about the century's rhetorical instruction. Johnson, who reads the Americans as preserving Blair's "idealistic view of the edifying consequences of the study and practice of rhetoric" (86), sees nineteenth-century rhetoric as continuing to advance a civic ideal. Johnson finds American support for Blair's notion that "the exercise of taste and its application . . . confer particular virtues on the rhetor, including a liberal mind, a sensitive moral nature, and an ability to reinforce 'elevated' thoughts and feelings in others" (87). Like Crowley, she links Blair's rhetorical ideals to those of Quintilian, but she finds that Blair's American successors also "reiterated the classical maxim that it is the good person speaking well who is best able to persuade" (166).

Johnson and Crowley cite similar sources;[16] the differences in their interpretations have to do with the purposes and emphases of their inquiries. Both of their claims about the place of taste in nineteenth-century rhetorics support my contention that rhetoric of the period was largely representative of humanist rather than technē traditions. Atwill's analysis of humanist traditions shows that the classical and bourgeois ideas of taste, which Johnson and Crowley respectively attribute to nineteenth-century rhetoric, are two versions of humanist tradition. The classical ideal emphasizes communally conferred values, the bourgeois stresses individually acquired ones, but the two share a normalizing social function grounded by a universalization of culturally bound traits.

---

[16] In analyzing nineteenth-century rhetorical concepts of taste, Crowley uses four works published between 1851 and 1864, falling within the longer period of 1820 to 1900 covered by Johnson's ten sources. Two sources, Samuel Newman's A Practical System of Rhetoric and G. P. Quackenbos's Advanced Course of Composition and Rhetoric, appear in both analyses, although Johnson and Crowley use different editions. Crowley cites Newman's 1851 edition and Quackenbos's 1864 edition, along with Henry Coppee's Elements of Rhetoric (1860) and James Boyd's Elements of English Composition (1860). Newman's 1834 edition and Alexander Jamieson's Grammar of Rhetoric and Polite Literature (1820) illustrate for Johnson early American imitations of Blair, Quackenbos's 1855 edition an early synthesis of New Rhetorical theory (76-78). After explicating the faculty of taste in these works (76-78), Johnson traces similar ideas on taste and criticism presented in later and less overtly belletristic works (78-86). These sources include Henry N. Day's Elements of the Art of Rhetoric (1866), Alexander Bain's English Composition and Rhetoric: A Manual (1866), James DeMille's The Elements of Rhetoric (1878), John Franklin Genung's The Working Principles of Rhetoric (1900), David J. Hill's The Elements of Rhetoric and Composition (1878), Adams Sherman Hill's The Principles of Rhetoric (1895), and T. W. Hunt's The Principles of Written Discourse (1884). The titles of several works, including Quackenbos's, Jamieson's, and Genung's, have been shortened here. Full titles, along with complete bibliographical information may be found in Johnson's bibliography (289-95) and Crowley's (279-300).

The purpose of Johnson's study is to locate the "characteristics of the nineteenth-century rhetorical tradition in North America" so that she may define the tradition and argue for its coherence (3). Crowley sets out to describe "the intellectual and institutional relations of literary studies to the required introductory composition course" in order to argue for composition's significance in the formation of English studies (2). Johnson's work is fairly philosophical, a history of the ideas constituting nineteenth-century rhetorics, whereas Crowley's is generally political, a history of power relations between literature and composition and commentary on the social implications of those disciplinary relations. (The subtitle of Crowley's book, "Historical and Polemical Essays," accurately reflects this orientation.)

Crowley explains the social-control function, which the classical concept of the ideal rhetor acquired within a modern, or post-Enlightenment, philosophy of individual liberalism--a function realized in late nineteenth-century American rhetorics (23-45). While classical rhetoric was "classbound," Crowley notes, it "did not include explicit instructions to students on how to go about discriminating between themselves and their social inferiors, as did the nineteenth-century pedagogy of taste" (36). She argues that American rhetoricians intellectualized the aesthetics introduced in the New Rhetoric by expanding and universalizing "taste." Aesthetics became a philosophical matter reflective of human nature (as evidenced in university curricula), rather than a rhetorical one bound to context. Taste acquired a disciplining function on an

individual level (providing a means of control over one's response to beauty) and on a social level (providing a mark of class distinction).

Although Crowley does not cite Blair directly, his Lectures support her claim of difference between his ideas on taste and those of his successors. Blair pointedly refrains from universalizing taste, explaining that "if it be owing in part to nature, it is owing to education and culture still more" (38). Likewise in answer to the question of whether there is a definitive standard of "good and bad" taste, he finds a natural standard only in judging how closely a work of art approximates its subject in reality (44). For other aspects of aesthetic value, he states: "To the sense of mankind the ultimate appeal must ever lie, in all works of taste" (44). He bases his standard, then, on "the concurring sentiments of men," specifically those living in cultures "favourable to the proper exertions of taste," not those in "uncivilized" or "loose nations" (45). Today's readers would reject this view as condescending, but even as Blair denigrates the aesthetic values of people outside "civilized" cultures, he envisions a mostly contextual basis for aesthetic judgments. Taste for Blair is not simply dictated by human nature.

The American works further universalize taste, removing it from the rhetorical realm to the philosophical. A step in this direction is evident in a passage Crowley cites from Newman's text, in which taste is now a class marker, distinguishing cultured and noncultured persons with the same civilized country (England). To illustrate taste's value, Newman contrasts Addison, appreciating the beauty of a starlit sky, and a laborer returning from work under the same sky, oblivious to its sublimity. Crowley remarks that the "subtext cannot have been

lost" on students: "if you wish to be included among the cultural elite, you cannot fail to notice the beauties of nature or art" (39). The mere suggestion of more specific class-linked standards of taste constitutes a subtle but significant departure from Blair's refusal to prescribe such specifics. Americans moved toward increasingly specific standards, until later texts simply assumed a rationale of implicit, universally recognized standards of educated grammar and diction (Crowley, Composition 38-42, 60-62; Connors 13, 112-170; Berlin, Writing Instruction 71-74; Kitzhaber 187-204).

If Johnson ignores this socially significant difference between nineteenth- and eighteenth-century rhetorics, perhaps it is because there is an essential element of similarity in the classical ideal rhetor and the modern genteel bourgeois. They both serve as moral standards, as she notes, designed to guide students' behavior in social contexts. Bringing the science of mental faculties to a classically oriented view of rhetoric, Blair and Campbell effectively elaborated on Quintilian's ideal of the good man speaking well, attempting to clarify various human characteristics of discernment that constitute such a rhetorical ideal. Whether one focuses on nineteenth-century rhetoric's "extension" of this ideal, as Johnson does, or on revisions of it, as Crowley does, the fact remains that the resulting rhetoric, like its predecessor, adhered to a humanist as opposed to technē tradition. Atwill presents Quintilian's vir bonus as the epitome of humanism (31-38); for Quintilian, good character was the "objective of a rhetorical education" (Atwill 31). Elaborations on this idea did not change the culture-preserving function of rhetorical instruction; rather, they served mainly to specify and

normalize the qualities counting as "good." This effect is further apparent in Clark and Halloran's analysis of the "professional" impulse in education and rhetoric.

Professionalism

Drawing from Bledstein's idea of the "culture of professionalism," Clark and Halloran depict the transformation of an oratorical culture supported by neoclassical, communal, civic rhetoric at the beginning of the nineteenth century to a professional culture supported by written, individualized, privatized rhetorics by the end of the century. Over the course of the century they posit a transformation of the "public realm from a setting for socialization to a setting for individuation" (13). Whereas Johnson finds much similarity and Crowley much difference between New Rhetorical and late nineteenth-century ideas of taste, Clark and Halloran see a distinct change occurring between the neoclassical rhetorics of the early nineteenth century and the belletristic rhetorics of Blair and his followers. Clark and Halloran view "taste" in belletristic rhetoric as analogous to "eloquence" in classical and American neoclassical rhetoric. Taste, an "inward response," though, replaced eloquence, an outward manifestation, in an overall shift of educational and rhetorical goals from "socialization" to "individuation" (Clark and Halloran 15-16). Again, according to Atwill's humanist-technē scheme, the paired ideas of socialization and individuation, eloquence and taste, or classical and bourgeois taste each represent two sides of a humanist coin. Rhetoric's primary function as a carrier of class-linked cultural

knowledge and values remains constant through each of these variously configured shifts.

Science alone cannot explain the nineteenth-century transformations of American culture and rhetoric, according to Clark and Halloran, but it was a significant factor as part of the "professional ethos" identified with college education (19-21). As Bledstein notes, professional knowledge (the class marker of the new elite in American democracy), by virtue of its scientific and theoretical foundations, was considered morally and politically neutral. Clark and Halloran contend that current-traditional rhetoric developed in service of professionalism. As they put it,

> By defining knowledge-bearing communities as private enclaves of specialists and knowledge as an economic commodity rather than a moral virtue, this professional ethos created the need for a rhetoric of morally neutral and exclusionary discourse, and current-traditional rhetoric arose to fill this need. (21)

An implicit assumption here is that neoclassical rhetoric, which they present current-traditional as having replaced, did entail knowledge equated with "moral virtue"--an equation Atwill finds typical of humanist rhetoric (17, 27-28). Clark and Halloran are in accord with Johnson, Crowley, and Berlin on this point: the neoclassical rhetoric of the early century was highly valued as a source of moral instruction for civic leaders. John Witherspoon and John Quincy Adams, whom Clark and Halloran offer as exemplars of American neoclassical rhetoric, fashioned their teachings after the humanist traditions of Quintilian and Cicero, invoking the ideal of the "good man skilled in speaking" (Clark and Halloran

16).[17] These rhetorics were valued for their ability to impart cultural knowledge and values, to condition students to a particular subjectivity.

Clark and Halloran's explicit premise that current-traditional rhetoric was perceived as morally neutral raises the question of how such a rhetoric could also be humanist, as I suggest it is. How could a morally neutral rhetoric embody a morally inflected cultural imperative? In short, a moral quality--that of being above common emotionalism--was ascribed to this scientistic subjectivity. Crowley provides insight into this issue. Nineteenth-century rhetoricians' philosophized ideal of taste, as she explains, was an abstract, intellectual response, removed from direct sensual experience. Taste was a "higher faculty, like reason and the imagination." Its exercise distinguished the "disciplined" response of the cultivated person, from the unrestrained response of the commoner (Composition 43-44). Furthermore, taste, like correct grammar, was seen as a reflection of right thinking.

Taste and correctness were also believed to transcend politics and class, since they were largely learned traits. To late nineteenth-century rhetoricians, these characteristics were part of a moral standard to which all persons should aspire. The idea that the quality of writing reflected the quality of the writer's thought underpinned certain writing pedagogies representing both "direct and indirect" methods. Instructors using direct methods held that students learned

[17] Whereas Atwill distinguishes the aims of Cicero's and Quintilian's educational theories (35-38), Clark and Halloran do not. In contrast to Quintilian's character-based ideal, Atwill argues that Cicero presents a rhetorical ideal based in part on the orator's character, and in part on rhetorical success.

"elegant expression" through "explicit study" and practice, whereas those using indirect methods believed students would absorb principles of good writing through exposure to great exemplars (89-90). These approaches coexisted, sometimes within one course or curriculum, at the end of the century (as they do today), as evidenced in various surveys of pedagogy (Brereton; Berlin, Writing Instruction, Rhetoric and Reality; Connors; Crowley).

The persistence of more than one approach to writing instruction is an important indicator that scientistic thinking was not the only manifestation of professionalism in American culture and education at the end of the nineteenth century. While Clark and Halloran present current-traditional rhetoric as originating in and functioning in service of professionalism, they acknowledge that "literary culture" was another component of professional culture (6). Crowley reminds us, too, that literature-based writing instruction has long been popular in this country. The "indirect" study of writing by reading literary models, introduced on this continent with Blair's belletristic rhetoric, persisted despite the popularity of more "direct" approaches like that of current-traditional pedagogy. Belletrism's longevity in writing instruction is not surprising, since most composition programs are connected with English departments (Crowley, Composition 10-14, 57, 89-90). At the same time, Crowley surmises that "current-traditional theory of discourse was the perfect vehicle for literary humanists insofar as it allowed them to meet the supposed necessity of installing literate correctness in every student who enrolled in the university. . ." (Composition 96). Rather than the antithetical competitors they are often

assumed to be, current-traditional and belletristic rhetorics present different means of socializing students to professional cultures. Their ability to perform this common role stems from their shared humanist roots.

Similarly, nineteenth-century rhetoric's stable motive of imparting culture, be it civic or professional, helps explain the elements of exclusivity Clark and Halloran find at work both at the beginning and end of the century, despite the significant changes that occurred over the century in society and education. Oratorical and professional cultures were limited to the general populace in different ways:

> Oratorical culture, built upon the common ground of the shared public knowledge of the relative few who had access to the public discourse, enabled them to confront their conflicts constructively. Professional culture, while providing to Americans who had never had it before access to knowledge and discourses of public consequence, is structured by boundaries of expertise that fragment public knowledge and prevent some significant conflicts in the community from ever being addressed collectively at all. (23-24)

Clark and Halloran find the significant loss in the nineteenth-century transformation was that of the American public's ability to function collectively (6). On this point their sentiments echo those of John Dewey in The Public and its Problems and G. Thomas Goodnight in "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Arguments," discussed in chapter one. Because specialization presumes standards disconnected from the larger community, the professional class created over the course of the century was not schooled "to think and act collectively beyond the boundaries of their professional subcultures" (Clark and

Halloran 24).[18] Clark and Halloran do not claim to offer a way out of this dilemma. They strongly imply that the neoclassical rhetoric of the early nineteenth century holds the key to a solution, though, and in this suggestion I contend that they are misled.

The neoclassical rhetoric Clark and Halloran present as supporting communal judgments in the early nineteenth-century public sphere also maintained the exclusivity of that public sphere. Elitism was not "accidental" to this rhetoric, as Halloran claims in another article (Wright and Halloran 240). As Atwill shows, the imposition of a cultural standard like that of Quintilian's "good man" as a requisite for the effective practice of rhetoric limits that rhetoric's potential for intervention in the status quo. Crowley goes so far as to suggest that cultural reproduction is inherent to classically-informed rhetoric (33), although Atwill disproves this idea by showing that Aristotle preserved significant aspects of the technē tradition of rhetoric. Clark and Halloran point to Isocrates and Quintilian as educators of eloquent, morally informed leaders (2); they do not distinguish as Atwill does between the disparate ideas of character development offered by these ancient exemplars. Crowley posits a pragmatic rhetoric based on Deweyan principles as an alternative to classically oriented rhetorics (15-17), but

[18] They do not mention Dewey or Goodnight, but they cite other sources on public versus professional discourse and knowledge: Kenneth Burke's A Rhetoric of Motives (Berkeley: U of California P, 1950, 1969), Eliot Friedson's Professional Powers: A Study of the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986), Philip Fisher's Hard Facts: Setting and Form in the American Novel (New York: Oxford U P, 1985), and Alasdair MacIntyre's Whose Justice? Which Rationality? (London: Duckworth, 1988).

she does not link this dynamic, adaptable idea to the ancient rhetorics of Isocrates or Aristotle.

Crowley and Clark and Halloran, criticizing different versions of the humanist rhetoric of the late nineteenth century, point to the need for a different kind of rhetorical education better suited to democratic principles. In reclaiming the technē tradition, Atwill furnishes some guidelines for such a rhetoric. Possibilities offered by the technē tradition for current pedagogy are taken up briefly in chapter five. I suggest there that the technē tradition has much to offer journalism as well as rhetoric, since journalism experienced a history quite similar to that of composition-rhetoric from which it originated, and it harbors similar problems stemming from that shared history.

Rhetoric outside of College

While this study focuses on rhetoric taught in college and just one area of rhetorical practice outside of college, that of journalism, much learning and practice of rhetoric took place among adults outside of college in the nineteenth century. Very few people went to college, even by the end of the century. While college attendance increased substantially in gross numbers in the early nineteenth century, a Barnard College study in 1870 found that between 1850 and 1870 northeastern colleges served a "decreasing percentage of the general population" (Bledstein 240-41). The declining popularity of college provided a major impetus for reforms that led to the creation of the university (Veysey 2-9). Early in the century, work opportunities opened in new industries, promising advancement for

young men without college training--indeed, college seemed superfluous to many ambitious youth.

Nevertheless, desire for education grew, as Americans perceived knowledge of all kinds, including rhetorical skills, as a means of individual fulfillment and socioeconomic advancement. A wealth of responses to popular demands for rhetorical education appeared in the nineteenth century, including the lyceum and Chautauqua movements (Antczak; Antczak and Siemers), literary and debate societies (McHenry; Gere; Hobbs), and a variety of rhetorical reading material including popular rhetorics, dictionaries, grammar books, and criticism (Cmiel, Democratic Eloquence). Studies of these extracurricular rhetorical practices reveal a range of motives. Some practices aimed at cultural preservation, reflecting the humanist tradition of rhetoric, whereas others showed evidence of political intervention and invention in the technē tradition of rhetoric. Some uses of rhetoric served a combination of purposes, as illustrated in Nicole Tonkovich's study of Godey's Lady's Book. While cultivating a deferential subjectivity among women, the journal also championed a collective letter-writing intervention designed to assuage hostility between North and South, as war threatened (158-160). At times, extracurricular rhetorical education, such as that of African Americans described by McHenry and Logan, gave rise to activism. Participation in abolition and women's suffrage movements gave women a rhetorical education they had not gained in school (K. Campbell, Man Cannot Speak for Her).

These examples provide evidence that rhetorical practice outside the academy could and did become a powerful tool for citizens seeking political change. They show that the humanist tradition of rhetorical education, presented in some of these popular rhetorical practices as well as in the colleges, does not prevent people from using rhetoric as technē to intervene in situations of consequence to themselves and others. But those instances in which people without access to college education implemented the rhetorical skill they gained elsewhere to participate in public action present examples which should inspire rhetorical education for democracy.

JOURNALISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Overview

Journalism professionalized over the nineteenth century, through processes of specialization and diversification similar to those that occurred in rhetoric and in education. Journalism went from a generalist's occupation, most often a one-person operation, to a specialized field of writing and editing within more complex publishing organizations. At the beginning of the century, a lone printer typically solicited advertising, announcements, and speeches from politicians, political parties, or merchants; gathered additional items from other newspapers; wrote an editorial; and set all of these in type. The printer-journalist, usually a man, also took care of subscriptions, mailing, and accounting, and probably attended to press maintenance (Schudson, Discovering 14-17).[19]

[19] Women decidedly were the exception in early printing and journalism, but they existed from the beginning of colonial publishing (Adams A Group 2). Notably, Elizabeth Glover opened the first printing office in North America, after

Political and commercial papers alike, sold on a subscription basis, were heavily underwritten by political-party and government subsidies, which kept the printer in business (Baldasty 16-29). With the advent of mass-circulation penny papers in the 1830s, periodical production compartmentalized. Business concerns (ownership and capital, advertising, subscriptions, delivery, and plant operations) grew distinct from editorial concerns (writing, editing, and layout), the latter comprising the vocation recognized as "journalism" by the last decade of the century (Schudson, Discovering 14-87; O'Dell).

News diversified in terms of topics and rhetorical appeals over the century. The penny press widened its range of topics beyond commerce and politics to include new categories such as crime and society, and it popularized a new genre, the "human interest story" (Schudson, Discovering 24-29). Late in the century news-writing professionalized along scientific and belletristic emphases parallel to those in rhetoric, as reporters developed other distinct genres and styles (Schudson, Discovering 71-120). As in other areas of expertise, higher education played a role in the professionalization of journalism. At first skeptical of the value of college education to what they viewed as a "craft" or "trade," journalists gradually came to accept college education as useful preparation for reporters and editors. After the Civil War, a movement for specialized college training in journalism gathered momentum, with journalists among its strongest supporters by the end of the century (O'Dell).

---

her husband died crossing the Atlantic (Adams, A Group 2; Adams cites Marion Marzolf, Up from the Footnote: A History of Women Journalists, New York: Hastings, 1977, 2).

Schudson shows the professional journalist and informed citizen developing simultaneously (Good Citizen). His account reaffirms the assessments of Bledstein and Adams (Progressive Politics), that professionalism separated ordinary citizens from experts with respect to given fields of proficiency. Higher education participated in this simultaneously democratic and exclusionary development by offering specialized curricula, including the division of rhetoric into introductory and advanced specialties, which created the categories of sociopolitical subjectivity that Adams calls the "Unknown Citizen" and "Big Persuasion" (Progressive Politics). Journalists participated in these developments, Schudson notes, by offering citizens a key source of the specialized information they needed in order to acquire adequate knowledge for decision-making about increasingly arcane governmental affairs.

Journalism outside and inside the academy generally followed patterns of professionalism found in rhetoric and in higher education, reflecting both scientistic and belletristic impulses. O'Dell distinguishes between "business" and "editorial" models in journalism education, whereas Sutton finds a similar difference between "practical" and "cultural" models. Like different aims in rhetoric and education at large, those in journalism were as convergent as they were divergent, tending to support a political hierarchy of experts, informed, and uninformed citizens.

Journalism outside of College

In The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life, Michael Schudson places within the larger context of "civic life" some of the insights into

journalism's history and sociology offered in his previous works (e.g., Discovering the News, The Power of News). Insights from The Good Citizen allow the incorporation of journalism into the picture sketched above of the interplay of higher education and rhetoric in the development of professional culture. Schudson's examination of citizenship further illuminates how simultaneous impulses toward democratization and professionalization engendered exclusionary political practices. Professionalization checked democracy by installing a newly limiting ideal, the "informed citizen." This Progressive ideal of citizenship depended on expert knowledge, as Bledstein and Schudson both point out.

Tracing changes in American experiences of citizenship from colonial to present times, Schudson identifies four eras characterized by different kinds of political relationships, sources of authority, and bases of citizens' knowledge. The two middle eras covered by Schudson encompass the period of concern to this study--the nineteenth century and first two decades of the twentieth. From 1801 to 1865 a "politics of affiliation" prevailed, in which citizens experienced civic life through "interpersonal" relationships formed in voluntary associations, especially political parties. In this era, citizens possessed not so much a knowledge of specific political issues as an "enthusiasm for partisanship" (Schudson, Good Citizen 8, 90-132). From 1865 to 1920, first Mugwump and then Progressive reforms ended party control over political participation, ushering in an era of the "informed citizen" at the turn of the century (Schudson, Good Citizen 8, 144-87). This political ideal centered on impersonal relationships

among citizens and experts. Informed citizenship was predicated on certain types of knowledge--"expertise," "science," "information"--acquired independently from newspapers and other sources (Schudson, Good Citizen 8).

Shunning undue nostalgia for any past system, Schudson carefully illuminates different types of exclusion that thwarted egalitarian impulses. At every turn, formal and informal extensions of political franchise met with new restrictions. Likewise Schudson's analysis shows that the history of journalism over the nineteenth century cannot be read in simple terms of decline or progress. His social-history approaches to journalism and citizenship are compatible with the Burkean idea of transformation that I have followed Clark and Halloran in using to read the history of rhetoric. The "distrust of democracy" Schudson finds recurring in various guises throughout the history of American civic life is congruent with the humanist, cultural-preservation motives found in rhetorical instruction, including the specialized courses offered to journalists.

Journalism from 1801 to 1865

In the period Schudson identifies with a "politics of affiliation," journalism was considerably interconnected with politics, but it was not the sole or even primary means by which citizens received political news. Parties served as the primary "institution for the political education and mobilization of the voting population . . . , and for the creation of a functioning leadership" in public offices. As Schudson puts it, parties, not the press, constituted "a fourth branch of government" in the nineteenth century prior to the Civil War (Schudson, Good Citizen 132). While journalists operated within a party system, in the new mass-

circulation newspapers--of which Benjamin Day's New York Sun was the first in 1833--they developed initiatives that signaled an impulse toward professionalization. Significant among these initiatives were diversification of news topics and specialization in reporting.

Schudson describes journalism of this era as a branch of political work. In a statement reminiscent of Aristotle's ambiguous placement of rhetoric within the praxis of politics (Nicomachan Ethics I.2, 1094b1-5),[20] Schudson remarks that journalism was "not an independent calling so much as one path within the political world of the mid-nineteenth century" (Good Citizen 122). Furthermore this "political world" revolved around parties and other organizations. The penny press of the 1830s loudly proclaimed its "independence" from political parties, but in practice most newspapers benefited from party patronage into the 1860s and 70s (Schudson, Good Citizen 120-22; Summers). Schudson contends that "the metropolitan press at mid-century was practically a sub-division of the political party," with journalists perennially awarded political appointments for their campaign work and newspapers continuing to receive government printing contracts (Good Citizen 122). When the creation of the Government Printing Office in 1861 did away with official patronage of presses, government offices continued to subsidize newspapers through advertising contracts (Schudson, Good Citizen 121). As Mark Wahlgren Summers shows in The Press Gang, even after the Civil War, while newspapers increasingly distanced themselves from political parties, reporters remained at the center of politics into the 1870s, at which time

[20] On the ambiguity of this remark when it is juxtaposed with Aristotle's definition of rhetoric as technē rather than praxis, see Atwill 168-76.

politicians and readers alike grew wary of their influence-mongering. Far from disinterested in these initial decades of the "independent" press, Washington reporters in particular established their own "independence," i.e., a political autonomy in which they assumed public prominence with opinions offered under pen names to an avid readership (Summers).

Some newspaper editors aligned themselves with political life by explicitly seeking to build publics, in what Schudson calls as an "associational model" of the press (Schudson, Good Citizen 122-23). Alexis de Tocqueville, visiting the United States in 1831-32, viewed American papers in this way, remarking, "'Newspapers make associations, and associations make newspapers,'" an interaction he valued as a check against usurpation of power by individuals or factions (qtd. in Schudson, Good Citizen 122). In 1837 The Weekly Advocate presented itself as a public-building forum for free African Americans, and William Lloyd Garrison's abolitionist paper, The Liberator, announced a similar public-forming purpose. As Schudson points out, the associational function was antithetical to the penny press, which expressly appealed to individuals; James Gordon Bennett touted The New York Herald's single-copy sales as a "non-subscriber plan" (Good Citizen 123). However, the penny papers did not displace the associational model of the press; public-building papers existed before and after the 1830s (Schudson, Good Citizen 123).

The enduring attention paid to public oratory in the first half of the nineteenth century provides further evidence that the newspaper remained subservient to association- and party-driven politics. Just as rhetoricians find

"oratorical culture" characteristic of this era (Clark and Halloran), Schudson notes an "extraordinary faith in the power of oratory" (Good Citizen 127). Echoing rhetoricians' further observation that college writing instruction served mainly as "scripted speech" (Wright and Halloran), Schudson depicts the press as "the patron of oratory" (Good Citizen 126).

The pre-Civil War press "amplified" political oratory more or less directly, Schudson suggests. Circular letters were an important means by which US legislators reached constituents. Representatives might send out hundreds of thousands of copies of these letters not only to individuals but also to newspaper offices, which would then print entire speech texts verbatim (Good Citizen 127-28). Reporters covering the US Congress served much as press agents or speechwriters do for today's politicians. After taking notes on a debate or floor speech, they went over the remarks with legislators, "in a consultative relationship," helping officials polish the texts. Journalists did not rush a speech into print, Schudson adds; rather, "it was common practice for politicians to have publication of their remarks delayed until the memory of what they actually had said would not jar too sharply with the printed record" (Good Citizen 126). This type of reporting enhanced legislators' interest in floor action as much as it captured citizens' attention. One senator revealed in private correspondence that his Senate colleagues did not listen to each other in debate, whereas House

representatives paid more attention to each other. He attributed the phenomenon to better press coverage of the House (Schudson, Good Citizen 127).[21]

The territory covered by press-amplified oratory widened tremendously in the first half of the century, with the expansion of the newspaper industry. In 1800, there were "241 papers of varying periodicity, most of them weeklies" published in the United States; by 1850, there were 2,000 (Schudson, Good Citizen 116). This expansion was already underway when the penny papers appeared in the 1830s. From the 1790s to the 1820s, newspaper subscriptions rose from an estimated third to one half of the households in the United States (Schudson, Good Citizen 119). Schudson remarks, "The newspapers helped spawn, even in rural areas, a newly fashionable habit of 'keeping up with the world'" (Good Citizen 119). This "keeping up" differed from the normative standard of the "informed citizen" that developed later in the century. In Schudson's depiction of this earlier era, news was less directly linked to political participation, providing a common ground for conversation and association among citizens. By the same token, the "world" depicted in the news was decidedly not one of local politics in the first decades of the century; papers throughout the country focused on state, national, and foreign events.

---

[21] The remark is attributed to Senator William Plumer, of New Hampshire, writing to his son in 1806; Schudson cites Noble E. Cunningham, Jr., The Process of Government Under Jefferson, Princeton: Princeton U P, 1978, 259, 268-70.

Explaining this comment, Schudson illuminates a distinction between the two chambers' preferences in rhetorical genres; the popularly elected representatives initiated more bills, took more roll call votes, and thus engaged frequently in deliberative debate. The senators did not deliberate as often and instead valued "formal oration," presumably epideictic (Good Citizen 127).

Neighborhood news, including local crimes and court proceedings, society events, weddings, deaths, and fires, was virtually an invention of the 1830s' penny press (Schudson, Discovering 24-31; Good Citizen 125-26). This type of news became increasingly common in metropolitan papers during the first half of the century, but even so, general-circulation newspapers kept the local news "apolitical" (Schudson, Good Citizen 119-20, 125).[22]

Competing for timely coverage of local events, penny papers initiated significant changes in journalism (Schudson, Discovering 12-31).[23] Not least among the penny press innovations was the position of hired reporter. Editors of penny papers also introduced "beat" reporting, assigning these new employees to gather news from specific segments of society and government (Schudson, Discovering 25-26, Good Citizen 119). The penny press introduced a new emphasis on accuracy, also, but not to the exacting, scientific-type standards identified with "objectivity" in the twentieth century. Nineteenth-century reporters sought to provide a generally truthful, yet colorful and entertaining depiction of events (Schudson, Discovering 25, 61-71). Until the last few decades

---

[22] See, for example, John Nerone, The Culture of the Press in the Early Republic: Cincinnati, 1793-1848, New York: Garland, 1989, which Schudson cites.

[23] David T. Z. Mindich takes issue with Schudson's claim that the penny papers represented a "revolution" in American journalism, insofar as Schudson associates this characterization with a Jacksonian spirit of democracy. Mindich seems to misread Schudson's "spirit of egalitarianism," though, faulting Schudson for failing to recognize actual income disparities, which are somewhat beside Schudson's point. Mindich's history of objectivity provides a useful extension to some of Schudson's research, as does Schiller's work on the subject. Neither of the later works contests facts concerning penny-press innovations mentioned here.

of the nineteenth century, news reports tended to be organized chronologically, reflecting an attempted faithfulness to occurrences (Schudson, Good Citizen 180). Washington reporters' enhancements of legislative oratory fell within the bounds of these standards.

Journalism from 1865 to 1920

In the era that Schudson describes as establishing a new ideal of informed citizenship, journalism became a career in its own right, no longer subservient to politics as it had been. In the 1870s and 80s a second wave of organizing arose, oriented toward professionalization and reform (Bledstein, 85-87; Schudson, Good Citizen 160). Parties lost their influence over political participation, as civil-service and election reform movements attacked party patronage. A new ideal of the independent voter emerged, which Schudson finds symbolized in the secret ballot adopted in most states between 1888 and 1896 (Good Citizen 168-170). Many states also passed legislation allowing for citizens' referenda or ballot initiatives. Upon these Mugwump efforts of the 1880s and 90s followed further Progressive reforms of the late 1990s to around 1915, aimed at refining voting systems and "purifying" citizenship, but effectively complicating procedures and severely limiting the franchise by direct and indirect means (Schudson, Good Citizen 171-74, 182-85). In this newly regimented political culture, news took on the function of informing the independent voter. Journalists, key providers of the "intelligence" deemed requisite for political participation, claimed their place in America's new professional elite (Schudson, Good Citizen 182).

Schudson identifies several significant professional characteristics acquired by the field of journalism in the 1880s and 90s. For one thing, journalists began to boast of professional status, whereas earlier in the century they encouraged the stereotype of reporting as "just a job" (Schudson, Discovering 69). E. L. Godkin wrote in the North American Review in 1890, for example, that reporting was "a new and important calling" (qtd. in Schudson, Discovering 70; Good Citizen 181). More significantly, salaries for reporters became the norm, in place of the erratic income they had previously received "on space" (Schudson, Discovering 69, Good Citizen 180-81). Like others who aspired to professional status, journalists formed societies in the last two decades of the century. Increasingly conscious of the reception of their work among colleagues, they compared notes and criticized each other in press clubs across the country (Schudson, Discovering 70; Good Citizen 181). Finally, this was an era "of the celebrity reporter," in which Nellie Bly, Richard Harding Davis, and others sought and achieved fame (Discovering 69-70; Good Citizen 181). These signs of professional consciousness were not unique to journalism, as Schudson points out (Good Citizen 182); many fields experienced such change amid the development of American professional culture, as Bledstein shows.

New genres of journalistic writing offer rhetorical evidence of a professional culture among journalists. Schudson finds two significant "literary innovations" in the interview, which appeared after the Civil War and became common by 1880, and the summary lead, prevalent after 1900 (Good Citizen 179-80). These innovations were rhetorical as much as literary, as they reflected

changes in journalists' understandings of their audiences, purposes, and other contextual aspects of writing. The changes developed, Schudson suggests, "out of the daily routines and presuppositions of reporters as they became newly aware of themselves as a corporate group" (Good Citizen 180).[24] These innovations also indicated that news stories were being "designed with readers in mind," in contrast to their former appearance as attempts to faithfully depict events (Schudson, Good Citizen 179). The interview story "presume[d] a reader who [was] less a partisan than a witness" (Schudson, Good Citizen 179). Commenting on the novelty of this genre, Schudson describes the interview as "a colloquy between a reporter and a public person" (Good Citizen 179). Highlighting reporters' proximity to public figures, the interview heightened journalists' images as experts. This particular innovation illustrates the distance implied between professionals and their client-publics, noted by Schudson (Good Citizen) and Bledstein. In their move toward professionalism, journalists were beginning to insert themselves as a distinct group of experts between public officials and the citizenry.

Belle Lettres and Science Converge in 1890s Journalism

Like rhetoric at the end of the nineteenth century, journalism acquired anti-democratic tendencies in the process of professionalizing, with contributions from belletrism and scientism. Schudson speculates that science increasingly became a conservative social tool over the course of the nineteenth century

[24] This suggestion is based on an assumption like that of Gaye Tuchman's seminal study of objectivity, which posits this characteristic of American journalism as based in the "strategic ritual" of reporters' daily work.

(Discovering 76), a hypothesis supported by Bledstein's study of the scientistic bases of professionalism (92-105). The empiricism that served democratic aims of displacing aristocratic power early in the century became a source of new elite authority by the end of the century. In the 1880s and 90s, journalists contributed to this deployment of science for elitist purposes by establishing professional standards that assigned moral value to facts. They subscribed also to a restraint--though not yet elimination--of emotion as well. In short, journalism developed professional standards like those represented by the scientism associated with current-traditional rhetoric and the aloof aesthetic of taste professed in late nineteenth-century American belletrism. The seemingly disparate belletristic and scientistic elements commingled considerably, as indicated in Schudson's discussion of the relationship between literary realism and professional journalism in the last decades of the 1800s. As in the case of rhetoric, belletristic and scientistic impulses in journalism also informed competing schools of thought, in the guise of ideals Schudson refers to as "story" versus "information" journalism.

Journalists professionalized, as did their cohorts in many other fields, by appealing to the authority of facts obtained through methods of investigation and observation understood as scientific. "Reporters in the 1890s saw themselves, in part, as scientists uncovering the economic and political facts of industrial life," in the same vein as Progressive reformers (Schudson, Discovering 71). Furthermore, like current-traditional rhetoricians, who equated correctness with right thinking, journalists imbued faithfulness to fact with a moral soundness. S. S. McClure instructed his writers in the 1890s and early 1900s to tell a good,

accurate, fact-filled story with an implicit moral (Schudson, Discovering 81). Tarbell's writings exemplify this fact-based morality, as shown in the next chapter. McClure's imperative seems to have been widely recognized by turn-of-the century reporters, who, while maintaining faith in the power of rhetorical appeals to emotion and values, shunned overt moralizing, which they associated with editorial-writing (Schudson, Discovering 120). As Schudson explains, journalists "prided themselves that their own moral precepts grew naturally out of their association with the real world." In contrast to the "dreamy" morality of editorial writers, reporters "took their own [moral declarations] to be as irrefutable as the facts they uncovered" (Discovering 87). Their belief that faithfulness to reality would convey moral truths is based on an epistemology common to belletristic and current-traditional rhetoric, which held that elements of good writing--aesthetic quality and correctness--grew out of human nature, properly cultivated.

Journalists simultaneously contributed and responded to the literary realism of the late nineteenth century, combining science and art in their work (Schudson Discovering 72-75). In this respect, too, they blended scientistic and belletristic elements found in rhetorical teachings of the era. While many reporters had backgrounds in science, many also had literary aspirations. Schudson provides several examples of each (Discovering 69-73), and I would add that McClure's colleagues Ray Stannard Baker and Ida M. Tarbell are examples of both. Baker had a bachelor of science degree from Michigan Agricultural College, and he wrote essays and fiction under the pen name David

Grayson. Tarbell aspired to be a biologist and wrote short stories and a novel. Journalists, like literary realists, "identified 'reality' with external phenomena which, they believed, were subject to laws of physical causality as natural science revealed them and as social science might reveal them" (Schudson, Discovering 74). This literary-realist epistemology common among journalists again echoes perceptions common to nineteenth-century belletristic and current-traditional rhetoric.

Schudson describes "two ideals" that emerged in journalism in the 1890s, one focused on "stories," the other on "information" (Discovering 88-89), a pairing reminiscent of belletristic and current-traditional pedagogies in rhetoric. Whereas I have argued that current-traditional and belletristic rhetoric represent two sides of a humanist coin, story and information journalism, strongly class-inflected ideals, present a similarly united binary. Perhaps somewhat counter-intuitively, story journalism may be roughly aligned with the utilitarian aims of current-traditional rhetoric, information journalism with the cultural aims of belletristic rhetoric. Both types of journalism, especially in editors' propagation of the differences between them in the 1890s, testify to the elitist cultural aims of professionalization in higher education and in journalism.

Story and information ideals are distinguished by the amount of emphasis they place on the journalistic imperatives of entertaining and informing their audiences, emphases that correspond to persuasive appeals to pathos and logos, respectively, in rhetoric. The story ideal, represented by the "new journalism" of the 1890s, known also as "yellow journalism," emphasizes entertainment, seeking

to "create, for readers, satisfying aesthetic experiences which help them to interpret their own lives and to relate them to the nation, town, or class to which they belong. . . . In this view, the newspaper acts as a guide to living not so much by providing facts as by selecting them and framing them" Schudson, Discovering 89). The information ideal emphasizes fact-based credibility, viewed as antithetical to embellishments associated with storytelling. Information journalism presents itself as providing "unframed" facts, readily verifiable and patently understandable in their transparency (Schudson, Discovering 89-90). Rhetorically, this distinction suggests that the two types of journalism emphasize different aspects of persuasion, in their efforts to gain and hold readers' attention. Story journalism features blatant appeals to pathos, or attempts at "putting the audience into a certain frame of mind," while information journalism highlights appeals to logos, or "the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words" or reasoning of the text (Aristotle, Rhetoric I. 2, 1356a1-5).

Critics perceived story journalism as appealing to lower middle classes, information journalism to upper classes. Using prominent New York examples, Schudson endeavors to locate reasons that Joseph Pulitzer's World and William Randolph Hearst's Journal (story journalism) and Adolph Ochs's Times (information) might have had such class-specific appeal, questioning also whether they in fact did (Discovering 90-120). He suggests that story journalism advertised itself as the champion of the working classes and presented urban news as an entertaining spectacle that nevertheless "nourished dreams" of advancement for those striving to assimilate into American culture and improve their economic

circumstances (91-101). Information journalism, in contrast, presented itself as the news source of choice for a class that had already arrived, one that valued "respectability" and disdained the blatant emotionalism represented by the "yellow" papers (106-16). However, he speculates that, despite appeals aimed at cultivating distinct classes of readers, the different types of publications probably reached rather diverse audiences. W. Joseph Campbell supports this hypothesis in his study of yellow journalism (51-63). Using census data of major US cities in 1900, Campbell refutes the "myths" that yellow journalism's readership was predominantly immigrant, lower class, or illiterate, showing that the genre flourished in cities of widely varying demographics. As it claimed to do, Campbell argues, the yellow press reached "across the urban social strata" to achieve its large circulation (55).

Schudson's analysis suggests that rather than appealing rhetorically to actually distinct audiences, story and information journalism constructed class subjectivities in their rhetorical appeals, which they invited their audiences to adopt.[25] The perception of "two journalisms," which grew from Ochs's own promotion of the Times as well as from critics who sided with him, reflects belletristic ideas of cultured and common tastes, like those presented in Newman's textbook example cited earlier, which attributed different aesthetic sensibilities to lower- and upper-class individuals. Schudson locates a "moral aspect" of periodical reading, a "pride" in reading the information journalism

[25] The summoned audience is explained as "the second persona" of a speech in Edwin Black's article of that title. I elaborate on this concept to inform my critique of Tarbell's journalism in chapter four.

associated with upper classes, and a "shame," at least on the part of the upper classes, in reading the story journalism associated with lower classes (Discovering 116-17). Identifying the basis of this morality in terms reminiscent of nineteenth-century rhetoric's faculty-psychology roots, he concludes: "The moral division of labor between newspapers, then, may parallel the moral division of the human faculties between the more respectable faculties of abstraction and the less respectable feelings" (Discovering 119). In short, information journalism is a "genre of self-denial," story journalism "one of self-indulgence" (Schudson, Discovering 119).

Schudson accepts these representations of taste as reasonable reflections of class experiences, positing that well-off readers were more mature and "rational" because they had achieved a certain level of control and order in their lives (Discovering 119). He associates this rational maturity with "affluence and education," as if it is a mere by-product of highly civilized human experience (Discovering 120). More likely, the well-off readers of the 1890s had been exposed to college, and had acquired, or learned to appreciate, a rationalistic ideal of taste imbued with the moral rectitude of a "human" appeal, presumed to be "universal."

Journalism in College

From the end of the Civil War to the end of the century, the value of college education became a widely discussed topic among journalists. Those who advocated it, whether in general or in the form of journalism-specific courses, saw college training as a means of enhancing journalism's professional status. Horace

Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune, famously dismissed the value of college to a reporter in the 1860s (Schudson, Discovering 68; Adams, History 100),[26] but Schudson notes that by 1900 an editorial in The Journalist proclaimed "college bred men [were] the rule" in the "profession" (qtd. in Discovering 68). The latter statement is surely an exaggeration, as DeForest O'Dell cites widely varying views among prominent journalists in the 1880s (38-46).[27] However, the claim of The Journalist, a trade publication, illustrates an opinion that was gaining favor among journalists as well as those in other fields: Professionalism and college education went hand in hand.

Proponents of college training for journalists generally coalesced into two groups, roughly aligned with utilitarian and cultural aims in higher education. Both expressed professional ideals, though, and like the current-traditional and belletristic pedagogies they resemble in rhetoric, the practical and cultural ideals of journalism training served more to distinguish the professional from the

---

[26] In response to questions on journalism education, for Charles F. Wingate's 1875 Views and Interviews on Journalism, Henry Watterson, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, claimed this sentiment was "falsely attributed" to Greeley. Watterson averred that at least two-thirds of the Tribune's reporters were college graduates (qtd. in O'Dell 31). O'Dell reports that Wingate found mixed opinion, including forceful dissent, toward journalism education, however.

[27] O'Dell quotes a number of examples from Eugene M. Camp's 1888 address to alumni of the Wharton School of Business, "Journalists, Born or Made?" Camp's informal survey of opinions, gathered over several years from interviews and printed sources, included significant opposition to college training for journalists, but he concluded their overall gist was that a college program, "correctly undertaken and judiciously carried out," could benefit journalists (qtd. in O'Dell 45). O'Dell credits Camp's address as the impetus for the Wharton School's establishment in 1893 of the country's first comprehensive program of college training in journalism (46).

ordinary citizen than they did to encourage journalists' engagement of citizens in public discourse. The professional ideals of journalism education, compatible with and to some extent informed by rhetoric, were not designed to serve the ends of wide, democratic participation. Rather, like the utilitarian institutions that sponsored them, journalism programs were more likely to contribute to conservative, trickle-down notions of democracy, in which an elite leadership corps presumes to know and speak the public will.

O'Dell, retracing the early movement toward higher education for journalism, identifies two general lines of thought on the subject. One group advocated practical training in all aspects of the "business" of journalism, while the other emphasized editorial aspects, downplaying or excluding areas such as advertising, printing, and management. A plan drafted (but not implemented) by Charles W. Eliot in 1903 and a similar curriculum established at the University of Missouri in 1908 represent the "business" model, whereas Joseph Pulitzer's plan, implemented at Columbia University in 1912, represents the "editorial" model (O'Dell 55-96; Sutton 7-16). Albert Alton Sutton finds in these initial plans "divergent viewpoints" on the relative value of "practical" (or "vocational") training and "cultural" (or "liberal") preparation, reflecting contrary ideas within higher education at large (9-15, 35). The cultural view stressed editorial skill, enhanced by wide knowledge gained in "background instruction in the social sciences" or other areas considered relevant to news reporting (Sutton 13-14). The practical view emphasized editorial and business skills and sought to provide

experience that would closely replicate journalists' practices in publishing a newspaper (Sutton 14).

Sutton's categories are hardly distinguishable on the bases he suggests, though, since vocational instruction within a college or university was almost de facto a combination of practical and cultural elements. After some initial experiments in the 1860s and 70s with instruction that focused on printing techniques,[28] leaders in journalism education generally came to agree on the desirability of combining technical training, some of it preferably hands-on, with broad learning. Katherine H. Adams presents Pulitzer and Eliot, among others, as subscribing to the same general "model," which "combin[ed] traditional liberal arts study with journalism classes in a four- or five-year college program" (Professional Writing 102). An extreme technical approach might be one that sent journalists to news organizations to get all their training, bypassing college altogether; but by the 1880s professionalism seemed, to many people, to demand college. An extreme cultural approach would also leave technical training to the news organizations, while seeking to provide the journalist with a broad, general education in college. Many journalists advanced this idea in opposition to specialized college training. The Boston Globe's Charles H. Taylor represents this view with his comment, repeated in Eugene M. Camp's 1888 address (see note 27):

[28] Prior to the 1890s, initiatives for journalism education were often associated with printing instruction. For example, a course in "practical printing" at Kansas State, begun in 1873, merged in 1916 with the Department of Industrial Journalism. The Washington College (later Washington and Lee) apprenticeship in printing and journalism established by Robert E. Lee in 1869, was discontinued in 1878, apparently without having trained any students (Sutton 7, 10).

> [T]o be a successful journalist, one must be a broad, many-sided, human. A college course that will foster human sympathies, that will keep young men out of ruts of thought and teach them, or lead them to collect, a vast amount of general information, will hew out good material from which to make journalists. . . . I do not believe that practical journalism can be taught to-day in our colleges to any advantage. (qtd. in O'Dell 44)

To argue for specific journalism curricula at all was to argue for some amount of practical training to be added to existing general studies.

Sutton observes an inclination in journalism instruction toward the cultural approach by the 1940s, following a general trend in attitudes toward vocational subjects in college (14-15). His remarks indicate that journalism experienced a validation process common among career-focused curricula, as educators debated the place of vocational training in colleges and universities. Vocational subjects found a home in universities only to the extent that they could be justified as "higher" learning (Veysey 66-73). As a "profession," journalism was a likely prospect for college attention; as a "trade," as earlier designated, it was not. Here the symbiosis of professionalism and higher education reveals itself: Journalism education followed the imperatives of professionalism, which called not merely for specialized vocational training but also for the wide learning associated with college itself.

Eliot, depicted by O'Dell and Sutton as chief purveyor of the practical view, initially expressed an opinion remarkably like that of the culturists, illustrating the convergence of practical and cultural views toward professional training for journalists. In a lukewarm response in 1903 to Pulitzer's proposal to fund a journalism school, potentially at Harvard, Eliot flatly states,

> Since the subjects which a journalist needs to understand, and the peculiar training which he also needs, are to be found in the arts and science departments of colleges and universities, it does not seem to me to be necessary, or even desirable, that the journalist should seek a special school of journalism. His profession does not require special training like that needed for law, medicine, or engineering. (qtd. in O'Dell 80)

His comments are quite similar to those of Taylor, quoted above. He concedes that a lone professor, with "experience in journalism" and still working part-time in the field, would be of value to aspiring journalists. For this provision, he says, he would accept some money (qtd. in O'Dell 80). A few weeks later, in a second letter Eliot comes up with the "business" type curriculum, emphasizing courses in newspaper "administration" and "manufacture," as well as press law, ethics, and history, with instruction in "literary forms of newspapers--approved usages in punctuation, spelling, abbreviations, typography, etc.," added almost as an afterthought (qtd. in O'Dell (81-84). Yet Eliot remained committed to the broad education associated with the cultural approach. In this second letter he again points to existing Harvard courses of benefit to prospective journalists, on "recent history, on the history of English, on government, jurisprudence, diplomacy, sociology, finance, statistics, economics, ethics, psychology, the history of art, and the principles of design" (qtd. in O'Dell 81).

Proponents of cultural and practical training also expressed similar lofty ideals for journalism as a public service. Pulitzer and Eliot, for example, despite their different visions of the training, shared similar notions of its value to society (O'Dell 94). Pulitzer's vision, expressed in Hosmer's 1903 pamphlet, "The Making of a Journalist," which the editor used to propose his endowment of a

journalism school,[29] assigned a crucial function in American democracy to well-educated journalists. The United States, Hosmer asserts, is

> the country where an enlightened public is more powerful than any other single force; and the newspapers are the organs of the common mind in developing, shaping, and declaring that opinion. In no other country has the press the absolute freedom which is essential to this function, for with us the press is free from every restraint except that of public opinion itself. (O'Dell 98)

He concludes his argument for journalism education by returning to this idea: "For the United States public opinion is sovereign and the newspapers focus and culminate public opinion. Is it not time that this institution, of such vast power in the life of the nation, should be developed on the higher plane of enlarged and enlightened study?" (105)

Fred Newton Scott, whose program resembled Pulitzer's, expressed similar ideas ("Training for Journalism"), as did many other advocates of journalism education (O'Dell 19-53). Walter Williams, who instituted the Missouri "business" model curriculum like the one Eliot proposed, espoused an ideal no less public-minded. In "The Journalist's Creed," Williams proclaims, "I believe that the public journal is a public trust; that all connected with it are, to the full measure of their responsibility, trustees for the public; that acceptance of lesser service than the public service is betrayal of this trust" (S. Williams, frontispiece).

---

[29] O'Dell includes the text of the pamphlet as an appendix (97-105). Pulitzer, wishing to remain anonymous, sent Hosmer with the pamphlet, to query presidents Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia and Eliot of Harvard, on their receptiveness to a journalism school endowment (O'Dell 58).

The primary difference between the "practical" and "cultural" views of journalism training remained a variation on O'Dell's "business" versus "editorial" distinction. These educational views were based on concepts of the profession itself. Eliot clearly saw journalism as a business. His "theory that all the forces of the newspaper are to be considered as one" was his major contribution to journalism education, in O'Dell's view. Eliot's idea was "that the editorial office and the business office had interests in common which brought them into close contact and called for careful training in editorial and business office procedure if the issues at hand were to be intelligently interpreted" (O'Dell 83-84). Likewise, Williams and other educators included courses in management and advertising in their curricula, treating journalism as a variety of business training.

Pulitzer's "editorial" vision of the profession excluded from journalism proper any aspects related to its management as a profit-making business, such as advertising and circulation concerns. His position seems somewhat at odds with his experience as a newspaper owner and investor (O'Dell 56-57, 65). O'Dell gives the following explanation for Pulitzer's emphasis on editorial training:

> He had always made money through his publications with comparative ease. Consequently, even though he wanted adequate profit for his newspaper workers, his own experience as a successful newspaper financier, and the deep regard in which he held professional public service caused him to emphasize editorial leadership and the collection and dissemination of news as a public service. . . . If a student needed [business] training, he could go elsewhere for it. . . . (65)

O'Dell concludes that Pulitzer was an idealist who "looked upon classroom instruction for the newspaper worker as a means of enhancing that individual's value as a servant to society" (66). However, the public-service motive does not

adequately explain the editorial view of journalism; Williams and Eliot, who viewed journalism as a business, also expressed public-service ideals, as indicated above. The "ease" with which Pulitzer found success in newspaper management is probably significant, as O'Dell suggests. Perhaps the "literary" side of the profession seemed more elusive, more worthy of college preparation to Pulitzer, who had only brief experience with reporting and, without a college degree, had sought his own liberal education in long hours at a public library (O'Dell 56). Certainly the liberal-arts cachet of editorial training made journalism seem more compatible with traditional college education.

After all, what distinguished the editorial approach to journalism education--and what made it "cultural"--is not so much its attention to background instruction, a feature it shared with the practical approach, but its basis in the view of journalism as a writer's occupation. Most journalism programs initiated in the 1880s and the following few decades grew out of composition-rhetoric curricula.[30] Viewed as a writer's profession, journalism was likely to be considered academically as a branch of English or rhetoric, and hence as a liberal art, an element of liberal-cultural education. Adams presents

---

[30] In addition to the University of Michigan, discussed in chapter two, other examples include University of Missouri, where David Russell McAnally, Jr., taught a journalism history course in English from 1879-80 through 1884-85 (S. Williams 13); the University of Kansas, where Edwin M. Hopkins first offered newswriting in the English Department in 1894 (Adams, Professional Writing 111); and the University of Illinois, where Frank W. Scott and Thomas Arkle Clark began teaching journalism in the Department of Rhetoric and Oratory in 1902-03 (O'Dell 68). Exceptions include Wharton's program, established in 1893, as mentioned in note 27, and Columbia's school endowed by Pulitzer, which opened in 1912.

journalism in this era as "being approached as 'writing'" and thus as being taught mainly by English professors (Professional Writing 103). Many of these faculty members who initiated or took on journalism teaching had been reporters or editors, as had Fred Newton Scott. Others were hired from newspapers expressly to provide journalism instruction (Adams, Professional Writing 104). Academics and journalists collaborated in developing curricula at some ten to twenty institutions before 1910 (Adams, Professional Writing 103-4; Sutton 7-14, 19). However, journalism proved an uneasy fit with literature and composition-rhetoric, as Adams notes (Professional Writing 115-18), and as Scott's program illustrates. By 1920 journalism had differentiated itself from English, rhetoric, and even the liberal arts to some extent, to become a distinct area of study. Later it became a research discipline among social sciences rather than humanities.

The shift is not hard to understand, given that editorial instruction, taught under the auspices of English and rhetoric, constituted the "practical" arm of the cultural or editorial approach to journalism training (in comparison to the liberal study of "background courses"). Adams describes a movement toward increasing practicality in the teaching of editorial skills, especially between 1900 and 1920, although she notes that practical instruction was of concern to journalism instructors from the start (Professional Writing 105-18). Journalism professors implemented and placed increasing emphasis on the "laboratory model" of writing instruction; Scott's Rapid Writing, in which students completed writing assignments within the class period, is a rudimentary example of this technique. Another version of laboratory instruction consisted of work on student

publications on- and off-campus, for which students earned academic credit; Scott used student publications at Michigan for this purpose. Courses attended to practice in journalistic genres, often using professional texts as models, another feature of Scott's program. These and other practices distinguished journalism from composition-rhetoric courses, which, again as seen in Scott's program, stressed school-essay writing at lower levels and literary writing (critical or creative) at advanced levels. The growing distinction between composition and journalism is also evident in textbooks between 1900 and 1920 (Adams, Professional Writing 110-11).

Several reasons present themselves for the migration of journalism, with its focus on "practicality," away from rhetoric, English, and the liberal arts. Adams explains that the journalism faculty hired from newspapers did not conform to the academic promotion system; they did not have the same types of academic and publication experience as their colleagues in literature and rhetoric. Traditional liberal arts faculty considered the laboratory courses and other practical training "anti-intellectual." Finally, journalism's advancement as a profession and as an academic discipline was a large factor. The American Association of Teachers in Journalism and the American Association of Schools and Departments in Journalism, formed in 1912 and 1917, respectively, "propelled the movement to separate quarters," Adams says (116). The first criterion for membership in AASDJ was the existence of "a separate academic unit, such as a school or department of journalism, with a faculty of at least two full-time teachers of the rank of instructor" (qtd. in Sutton 27). Other

requirements included that the curriculum contain at least 24 undergraduate credit hours (of a standard 120) in journalism-specific courses, and some "laboratory work" (qtd. in Sutton 27). Later these entrance requirements formed the basis of AASDJ accreditation criteria for journalism programs (Sutton 28).

For leaders in the movement for journalism education, professionalism vied with public service as a primary concern. Walter Williams' public-service statement quoted above from "The Journalist's Creed," in fact, falls second among eight beliefs, following "I believe in the profession of journalism" (S. Williams, frontispiece). Similarly, Hosmer summarizes near the end of his argument, "In this proposition [for a journalism school] there lies, we believe, the possibility of great advantage to the profession itself, to the individual newspaper man and to the state" (104). The order of beneficiaries is very likely intentional. Hosmer devotes half his effort to arguing that the profession of journalism deserves at least the same academic attention as medicine and law, by virtue of the complex knowledge journalism requires as well as its importance to public welfare. Scott expressed his desire to elevate the esteem of the profession as well as that of journalism studies, suggesting that eventually the discipline might be viewed as the intellectual equal of "mathematics, logic, or political science" ("Training"). Such arguments are expected, of course, in attempts to introduce a new venture. The very novelty of the proposition, in addition to its vocational orientation, obliged proponents of journalism education to focus on professional aspects in nearly equal measure to public-service aspects of their curricula.

CONCLUSION: RHETORIC'S SEPARATION FROM PUBLIC PROCESSES

Implicated in these factors in journalism's separation from rhetoric--the contrasts journalism posed to rhetoric in faculty expertise and pedagogy, and the movement to establish journalism as a separate discipline--is the lack of connection between rhetoric and public life at the turn of the twentieth century. Journalism was seen as antithetical rather than congenial to rhetoric, as the latter was then taught and conceived. Rhetoric professionalized along current-traditional and belletristic rationales in the late nineteenth century. Journalism struggled to establish itself as a profession devoted to public service, often defined in terms of fostering and expressing public opinion--an ideal expressed in the ancient tradition of rhetoric as <u>technē</u>. That journalists did not view turn-of-the-century rhetoricians as compatriots in their public cause is significant. The case of Fred Newton Scott, presented in the last chapter, is indicative of composition-rhetoric's distance from public concerns. Scott, an unusual if not singular visionary of the potential for collaboration between journalists and rhetoricians in his time, worked hard to retain journalism as a liberal art. But his view of rhetoric and the liberal arts, informed by his study of Plato as well as by scientific and belletristic approaches of the day, proved ultimately incompatible with journalism.

As journalists attempted to reconcile professional and public service ideals, they could have benefited from an understanding of the educational tradition associated with rhetoric as <u>technē</u>, a tradition which focuses on disseminating artistic skill in public discourse and reasoning. Adams' history of

Progressives' influence on rhetorical instruction illustrates the potential effects of this type of understanding (Progressive Politics). As long as the teaching of journalism was anchored by the Progressives' strong public-service agenda, as it most obviously was for a time at the University of Wisconsin, it succeeded in contributing to public reforms of corrupt politics and business. The farther the training traveled from its Progressive ideological roots, the more it was turned toward purposes opposed to Progressive politics (Adams, Progressive Politics ch. 4). Additionally, the Progressives' focus on expert leadership did not encourage citizen-based initiatives (Adams, Progressive Politics 69). Professional communicators learned rhetoric as technē, a powerful tool for change, while all others learned rhetoric as a way of acquiring culture and skills necessary for individual professional advancement (Adams, Progressive Politics chs. 1, 2, 7).

What if, instead of Progressive ideology, the understanding of rhetoric as technē, a public dynamis--not a partisan ideology, but a heuristic theory of the art central to democratic political processes--had informed the teaching of rhetoric and the discipline of journalism, which generally grew from it? The question is impossible to answer, obviously. But in Progressive muckraking we have an example of rhetoric as technē in practice. In their practice of journalism, muckrakers invented a rhetoric of technē that few of them learned in college, because it did not exist in the curriculum. Leading muckrakers like Ida M. Tarbell and her colleagues at McClure's magazine were not graduates of Bleyer's program at Wisconsin. Tarbell's work, discussed in the next chapter, suggests

that she may have envisioned rhetoric as a citizens' art as well as a journalist's art, as she consistently invoked citizens and publics in her own use of rhetoric.

Chapter 4: Ida M. Tarbell, Rhetor

INTRODUCTION

Ida M. Tarbell made history as one of several pioneers of muckraking in American journalism, a movement credited alternately with instigating or reflecting reformist impulses of the Progressive era (Filler 243-58; Fitzpatrick 104-5; Weinberg and Weinberg xiii-xix, Kochersberger xxii). However, the common image of Tarbell as a spokeswoman for reform is misleading. For while articulating the need for popular, progressive reforms in business and government, she also argued for an increasingly unpopular, reactionary agenda on issues of women's rights (Camhi, Tomkins). Moreover, muckraking represents only a fraction of what she achieved during her long, multifaceted career (Kochersberger xvii-xviii, Beltz). Tarbell's writings reveal, nevertheless, an unwavering commitment to improving public life by invoking her audiences' awareness of themselves as citizens with the potential for collective action. With such clear intimations of public purpose, her career offers rich possibilities for rhetorical study.

Tarbell has garnered considerable attention from scholars of history, journalism, women's studies, and literature, but surprisingly little from rhetoricians.[1] Her anti-suffragist views probably contribute to this lack of

[1] See, for example, Beltz, Stinson, S. Weinberg, Weinberg and Weinberg, Miraldi, Camhi, Tomkins, and Kochersberger. As to rhetorical studies of Tarbell, Lillian P. Trubey, in speech communication, has studied Tarbell's speaking career.

attention, disqualifying her, for example, from Karlyn Kohrs Campbell's Man Cannot Speak for Her, a study of activist women rhetors of nineteenth-century America. Furthermore, Tarbell's renown as a journalist makes her an unlikely candidate for classically informed public-address studies in rhetoric, which traditionally focus on oratory. While Tarbell's writings might reasonably be the subject of media criticism, studies in that area more often address recent rather than historical practice. Rhetoricians' neglect of Tarbell may indeed exemplify the persistent and historical distance between rhetorical and journalistic ideas of public discourse that is the chief concern of this dissertation.

The variety of genres and opinions represented in Tarbell's writings poses a challenge to understanding her contributions to journalism and public life--a challenge heightened at times by disciplinary conventions. Using a rhetorical approach to traverse disciplinary boundaries contiguous with those of written genres (e.g., history, journalism, literature, biography), I offer a generalist's view of Tarbell's work as a rhetoric of public discourse. By "public discourse" I mean discourse that seeks to create and sustain the shared life of a public or interconnected publics, as articulated in chapter one. Viewing Tarbell's work from a rhetorical perspective provides insights into the seeming contradictions in her opinions. Focusing on her role as rhetor also illuminates the potential functions of Progressive muckraking and of journalism in general as generators of publics and public opinion.[2]

[2] With "generator" I allude to Aristotle's description of rhetoric as a dynamis, a human power used to further social-political life. As discussed in chapter one, I propose that rhetoric and journalism are interrelated arts of public discourse with the potential to work together in generating publics--i.e., powering

In the remainder of this introduction, I explain further this rhetorical approach and its rationale. The chapter then proceeds in two sections. The first recounts how Tarbell embarked upon her rhetorical career and how she portrayed her work in written commentary on it. The second section presents a two-part analysis of her writings as rhetoric. The first part of the rhetorical analysis addresses the question of what Tarbell's work can teach us about the public-building potential of Progressive muckraking and later journalistic practices influenced by the movement. The second part addresses the seeming contradictions between Tarbell's written opinions on women and the example she posed in person. I argue that Tarbell's writings, including her muckraking, represent an epideictic rhetoric of citizenship that urged individual responsibility in service of a common good. Tarbell used her public career to fulfill what she saw as woman's primary social responsibility, the moral guidance and education of citizens.

Ida Tarbell, Rhetor

By positing a view of Tarbell as rhetor, I intend to highlight the public role that she and other muckrakers assumed--a role that goes back at least to ancient Greece and the origins of Western rhetorical traditions. "Rhetor" generally denotes someone addressing a public verbally, either orally or in writing.[3] Arguably, to use this word is to allude somewhat self-consciously, if not explicitly

---

them, in the sense of setting them in motion and sustaining them as long as the members see a need to deliberate and act collectively.

[3] With "a" public, I wish to allow for the possibility of multiple publics, as discussed in chapter one.

as I do, to ancient public discourse traditions.[4] Rhetoric to the ancients was an art of speaking in public forums--the legislature, the law court, and the open meeting or ceremony. Aristotle, following Isocrates, as shown by Atwill and discussed in chapter one, taught an art of public speaking in which "public" means not only "in the open" but also "of the polis," the city-state that constituted "the" public or the citizenry. Citizens used rhetoric to address their peers as a public and to arrive at collective judgments that would advance or settle matters of shared public concern.[5]

---

[4] Among US academics the word "rhetoric," as opposed to more recent designations such as "communication" or "composition," expresses a deliberate, if distant, alignment with classical and in some cases especially Aristotelian traditions. As shown in chapter three, rhetoric taught in nineteenth-century American colleges derived from British teachings (mainly Scottish) fashioned from the works of Cicero, Quintilian, and Aristotle. Rhetoric as revived in the mid-twentieth century also made use of the ancient texts. "Rhetoric" thus implies "ancient" or perhaps "classically informed" or "distantly related to ancient" writings on the subject. As Bizzell and Herzberg put it, "To speak of classical rhetoric is . . . to speak of Aristotle's system and its elaboration by Cicero and Quintilian" (3). However, other Greek traditions are represented in the current canon of ancient rhetoric. Plato's ideas on rhetoric, as articulated in the Phaedrus and Gorgias, have inspired the works of rhetoricians such as Scott (see chapter two) and Richard M. Weaver. More recently, some rhetoricians have revived interest in works by Isocrates (e.g., Atwill, Poulakos), while others have looked to the Sophists as earlier practitioners of the art that became known as rhetoric (e.g., Atwill, Jarratt). I emphasize Aristotelian and Isocratean ideas because they present rhetoric as a generator of public judgments, rather than a servant to philosophy or a vehicle for expressing pre-formed thoughts. Like Atwill, I want to encourage the teaching of rhetoric as technē, an "art of intervention and invention," rather than rhetorical teaching that seeks to preserve a particular set of values, as discussed in chapters one through three. This concept of rhetoric is particularly useful in considering journalism practices, as I argue in chapter one.

[5] Isocrates of course did not use the word "rhetorikē," coined by Plato, but instead called the art of public discourse logōn technē. While some scholars contend that rhetoric did not exist before Plato, I am following Atwill, as

The current use of rhetor to denote a writer as well as a speaker has evolved from the ancient understanding that rhetoric, the art of speaking, involved composing some kind of script or plan of what to say.[6] Excelling at the art required considerable study and practice, according to the ancients. Composing an effective speech--one that would contribute constructively to public decision-making--required not only an understanding of the finer points of style but also, and more importantly, a broad knowledge of the public and a familiarity with the sciences, or bodies of knowledge, that contributed to decision-making.[7] A good

---

discussed in chapter one, who argues that Aristotle's Rhetoric extends Isocrates' logōn technē tradition (126-29).

"Peers" can be taken in two senses here; citizens shared equal status as participants in political processes, and this status was privileged, in an aristocratic sense, in Athenian democracy. Citizenship was reserved for property-holders; it was withheld from women and slaves, among others (Katula 12). Like most other rhetoricians working from these classical traditions, I must disclaim the elitism they involved (see, for example, Katula 9). By using classical rhetoric, I want to emphasize, where possible, the democratic processes rhetoric served while rejecting the exclusionary cultural practices that suffused their implementation.

[6] Three of Aristotle's five canons of rhetoric have to do with composing a speech: invention, arrangement, and style. The last canon, delivery, has to do with its performance before the audience. Memory is involved most obviously in performance but also in composing--particularly in use of topoi or loci, as McKeon explains in "Creativity and the Commonplace." The centrality of composing or writing to rhetoric is also underscored by the fact that Isocrates, a leading rhetorician of his time, had a reputation as a poor speaker himself but used his skill in teaching rhetoric and in writing speeches for others to give (Bizzell and Herzberg 25, 43; Katula and Murphy 45). See also chapters two and three on the disciplinary evolution that yielded "composition" and "oratory" from "rhetoric" at the University of Michigan and elsewhere.

[7] Aristotle emphasized that rhetoric is concerned with no particular subject or body of knowledge, but rather, it is applied universally across all subjects of human concern (Rhetoric 152). Isocrates held that a solid understanding of the matters at hand was a prerequisite for speaking well

rhetor was thus construed as an informed citizen, one with a firm grasp of the topics at hand as well as the character of the polis, one who might contribute to the formation and enactment of public decisions. This classically inspired understanding of rhetoric and the rhetor who practiced it describes the work Tarbell did most consistently during her career as a writer, speaker, and public servant. "Rhetor" takes into account the public nature of Tarbell's professional life, bringing into view a coherent public purpose among seemingly discrete segments of her career.

Traversing Genre Boundaries

Viewing Tarbell's career from a rhetorical perspective avoids the compartmentalization of literary and academic genres, affording a comprehensive understanding of her writings. Tarbell is remembered as a "one-book author" (Tomkins, "Preface" np), an image that slights her considerable influence as a popular writer and speaker, and public servant. Her underappreciation in academe, noted most recently by Steve Weinberg ("Patron Saint" 29), who is completing a new biography of her, may stem in part from the difficulty of characterizing Tarbell and her work. Was she a journalist, historian, biographer, creative writer, public servant, or lecturer? The answer is "yes," for she took on each of these professional roles at one time or another. Tarbell appears not to

---

(Antidosis 50). His notion of both the rhetorician and rhetor as learned citizens is also indicated in his insistence that the effective application of knowledge to practical, everyday decision-making was the truest indicator of wisdom. Isocrates called this art philosophy, rather than rhetoric; like the Sophists and unlike Plato, he made no distinction between the two (Antidosis 51; Bizzell and Herzberg 22, 25, 45; see also chapter one).

have settled on one line of work; nor did she arrive at a term that encompassed adequately the diverse nature of her career. The issue of what to call what she did caused her little apparent trouble, though; with each new pursuit she made timely and lasting contributions to public life.

For researchers in rhetoric and journalism, however, the question of how to characterize Tarbell's work is more significant. How we perceive what she was doing shapes what we make of her work and her place in various canons. Likewise the terms available to Tarbell undoubtedly shaped her own understanding of what she did. In suggesting that we view Tarbell as a rhetor, I propose a term that was unavailable to her in the sense that rhetoricians now use it. In her day the term would have been reminiscent of a declining academic tradition of oratory, as shown in chapter three.[8] However, viewing her work as rhetorical practice accommodates the various genres she used, highlighting their impact as public discourse.

Understanding Contrasts in Tarbell's Work

Reading Tarbell's writing as rhetoric provides an approach to contrasts presented in her reform-oriented muckraking and her conservative writings on woman's social role. On one hand Tarbell was among the Progressive era's most prominent advocates of democratic-minded reforms, especially in business. She became firmly ensconced in the muckraking movement with the 1902-04

[8] Nor is rhetor a viable term for journalists to apply to themselves today, since the word rhetoric as used outside of rhetoricians' circles refers most often to meaningless talk. Again, the distance between journalism and rhetoric is apparent.

publication of her exposé, The History of the Standard Oil Company. Her name rarely fails to appear in accounts or discussions of muckraking, along with McClure's Magazine colleagues Lincoln Steffens and Ray Stannard Baker, as among the movement's most popular, professional, and influential writers (see for example Fitzpatrick vii-viii; Weinberg and Weinberg xvi-xxii; Miraldi, Muckrakers xiv). On the other hand Tarbell differed with a significant contingent of reformers in her time--the groups agitating for women's suffrage. While she claims in her autobiography not to have "[fought] against" woman's suffrage, she publicly dissociated herself from the suffrage movement, and her name appeared among executive committee members in 1909 on the letterhead of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage (Tarbell, Day's Work 327; Camhi 160-63). Writing on "the woman question," which involved not only the debate over extending the vote but the societal implications of such a change, Tarbell espoused older nineteenth-century views that a woman's place was in the home (Business of Woman). Her stance shocked and disappointed her feminist contemporaries, many of them erstwhile colleagues on Progressive causes (Camhi 145-78; Tomkins 26; Treckel; Tarbell, Day's Work 320-22, 326-28).

In Ida M. Tarbell, the most thorough commentary on Tarbell's major works, Mary E. Tomkins argues that Tarbell simply failed to change with the times. Upon the demise of the Progressive movement, and even in the post-World War I disillusionment vividly evoked by Michael Schudson (Discovering 188-202, Good Citizen 121-34), she stood firm in beliefs characteristic of pre-Civil War America: Business could be prevailed upon to serve egalitarian ideals

of individual opportunity. Women and men were naturally and socially suited for separate spheres of action and influence. Tomkins identifies Tarbell's support of Alfred E. Smith over Herbert Hoover in the 1928 presidential election as the point at which the popular rhetor "ceased to speak for the majority. She had not changed, but the times had gone beyond her" (145). Tarbell espoused social and political ideals discarded by more liberal critics in the evolving opposition to corporate domination of public authority (Tomkins 138). Reading Tarbell's work as epideictic rhetoric provides further insight into the nuances of her vision of democracy and her "progressive conservative" opinions, as Tomkins refers to them (143).

An aspect of Tarbell's conservatism that remains particularly perplexing is the apparent contradiction between her stated views on woman's place in society and the example she presented as a successful journalist (Cahmi, Stinson, Tomkins, Treckel). Certainly Tarbell's alienation on the woman question from women with whom she otherwise often agreed illustrates the fallacy of suggesting that Tarbell, or anyone, was generally representative of the diverse Progressive-era reform efforts. Even so, the apparent contradiction remains puzzling, despite scholars' attempts to resolve it. Jane Jerome Camhi claims that Tarbell "was not troubled by an awareness of any lack of consistency" between her views and her career (158). Camhi concludes that Tarbell avoided confronting the contradiction in her life and views by claiming the question of woman's social role "unanswered" near the end of her life (159-60). Paula Treckel takes a psychological approach to the "contradictions between Tarbell's life and her

beliefs" (1), suggesting that the famous muckraker experienced self-doubts that would have been exacerbated by an acute awareness of being a woman pioneer in a man's field. Camhi's and Treckel's explanations do not give much consideration to the possibility of reconciling Tarbell's carefully expressed opinions with her own actions. Robert Stinson and Robert C. Kochersberger, Jr., sidestep the question of Tarbell's seemingly conflicting actions and opinions. Stinson maintains that Tarbell's views on women's roles remained largely consistent over her career, within a conservative to moderate range, and that her entry into journalism was not a radical departure from these views. Kochersberger, following Stinson, finds ambivalence over women's public roles in early Chautauquan articles, which influenced Tarbell's thinking (xxxiv-xxxv).

In emphasizing Tarbell's gradual entrance into her career, Stinson gestures toward an issue I explore: the congeniality of journalism, as Tarbell understood it, with her prescribed role for women, essentially that of "Republican Mother," as described by Linda K. Kerber. Reading Tarbell's journalism as epideictic rhetoric aimed at educating citizens of a democracy reveals a close relationship between the role Tarbell advocated for women at large and the one she assumed for herself.

TARBELL'S CAREER AS A RHETOR

Tarbell documents her entrance into journalism and many thoughts on her career in All in the Day's Work (1938), written when she was 80. Unlike many examples of the genre, Tarbell's autobiography is unusually well researched. In this respect it resembles her other nonfiction writing. She relies upon and often

quotes source materials such as letters, research notes, journals, and other records that she meticulously maintained throughout her life. While Tarbell uses the book to explain positions she took in earlier writings, as well as to respond occasionally to her critics, she maintains a tone of respect for others' views and avoids any hint of self-aggrandizing (Tomkins 16-17, 147; S. Weinberg, e-mail 8 July 2001). As the title suggests, Tarbell limits her account to matters she deems pertinent to her career. The book thus provides readers an acquaintance with Tarbell like that with a close colleague rather than an intimate friend. Within this limited scope, the autobiography serves as a valuable source on the events of Tarbell's career and her thoughtful opinions on them. I consult it extensively in this section, while also drawing from other research that uses Tarbell's archived papers (Tomkins, Camhi, Brady, Beltz).[9]

Tarbell was an accidental journalist and public figure, but she was a purposeful public servant. She did not seek the kind of career in public life that journalism eventually afforded her--compiling her magazine articles into acclaimed books, serving on public commissions at the President's invitation, touring the country on popular lecture circuits. The first profession to which she aspired, in fact, was that of a biologist. This is not to say that her public roles conflicted with her own sense of purpose. On the contrary, Tarbell pursued a career, but she did so with little apparent ambition of personal gain. She wished to support herself, and she acquired the business acumen to do so, but the career she pursued was one of public service above all else, very much in keeping with

[9] Steve Weinberg is at work on a biography of Tarbell, incorporating six years' research, forthcoming from W. W. Norton.

the personal philosophy expressed throughout her writings. She did not seek the fame and modest fortune that came to her but rather sought the means to perform what she saw as each person's duty: to develop one's talents and abilities and to use them to the fullest extent possible in service of family, community, and society. As she recounts in her autobiography, she developed this purpose early in life, and it sustained her into old age. Her enduring sense of private and public responsibility provides a basis for viewing Tarbell as a rhetor and the body of her public discourse, including her journalism, as rhetoric. As her autobiography makes clear, in the various kinds of work Tarbell did, she used rhetoric to address immediate, public concerns in an effort to contribute to what she saw as the common good.

How Biology Led to Rhetoric

Tarbell's initial aspiration to be a biologist quickly took on a broader social purpose than suggested by the image she presents of herself sequestered with a microscope in the "tower room" of her family's home (Day's Work 30). In the chapter of her autobiography entitled "I Decide to Be a Biologist," she describes her first career impulses in the context of three public upheavals that had profound effects on her and her family. Discussion in the 1860s and 70s of the new theory of evolution challenged the Christian account of the world's creation that she had grown up believing. The resurgence of the women's rights movement, after women's exclusion from the 14th Amendment passed in 1868, called into question the sex roles at the foundation of the existing social order and confronted Tarbell's sense of equality and fairness. And John D. Rockefeller's oil

combination in 1872 set out to abolish competition from independent oil-related businesses, including that of Tarbell's father (see note 10). By her own account, each of these events had an influence on the initial "platform" of goals that would guide Tarbell into adulthood--to pursue an education, avoid marriage, and seek her own livelihood (Day's Work 34, 36). In her accounts of the formative events, it is clear that they also reinforced religious and political principles that informed her social ideals and pointed her toward a life dedicated to public service through rhetoric.

Tarbell writes of longing to devote herself to scientific research after her introduction to the subject of biology at age 13 (Day's Work 21-22, 30, 48). Biology led her, by way of controversy fomenting over evolution theory, to a youthfully grandiose purpose of "find[ing] God" by searching out "the beginning of life" in cells and atoms (Day's Work 30). Soon after reading her father's copy of Hugh Miller's treatise on evolution, Testimony of the Rocks, she heard "the biblical day" of creation discussed in the Methodist church (Day's Work 27). A series of Sunday-night lectures on the topic by her erudite minister only served to deepen her crisis over the clash between science and Christianity, her two guiding systems of belief (Day's Work 28). Realizing that she could no longer accept fully some tenets of her religion, yet finding that science did not offer a moral compass like that of the Golden Rule, she felt she could not replace religion with science (Day's Work 28-30). Instead, she tempered her religious beliefs with scientific skepticism. The young Tarbell resolved to seek understanding of the

divine plan by studying life as she believed God had created it in nature (Day's Work 30).

Tarbell credits the women's rights movement with giving her the idea of pursuing her interest in science by going to college, although the activists did not win her complete support. The movement took on new vigor after 1868, as women never before moved to activism were outraged, according to Tarbell, by the introduction of "the word 'male' into the Constitution" with the 14th Amendment (31). Tarbell's parents, "always hospitable to crusaders," welcomed women's rights activists into their home, where their daughter recalls meeting Mary Livermore and Frances Willard (32). "[N]ot that either touched me, saw me; of this neglect I was acutely conscious," she adds, noting that male visitors to the house made a point of talking with her (32). Reading news of women's activism, Tarbell became aware that the suffragist movement was comprised of competing factions. She did not find within her experience evidence to corroborate "the subjection of women" (33), but she did find it unfair that women, responsible for household finances, were poorly informed and untrained for the task (34). From the women's rights movement as she encountered it, two rights that stood out as "worth going after" were "the right to an education, and the right to earn [her] living--education and economic independence" (34). She points out that a woman going to college in her day had the chance to be a "pioneer," to advance the cause of women's rights if she made a good showing, but she denies harboring such a lofty purpose at the time (35). Her "sense of responsibility was not lacking nor dormant" (35), but her primary reason for pursuing a college

education was to prepare herself for teaching, which she saw as the only way to support herself (34).

During this period, Tarbell's father, who manufactured and sold oil barrels, joined the "antimonopoly meetings" convened by independent operators in the oil businesses of western Pennsylvania.[10] Tarbell recalls that while she did not yet grasp the details, which she later meticulously gathered for her Standard Oil articles, her father impressed upon her "that what had been undertaken was wrong" (Day's Work 25). He compared the price-fixing agreement between Standard Oil and the railroads to forcing someone off the road, where the right of way applied equally to all. As she recounts her father's explanation, the railroads "ran through the valley by the consent of the people," and they had "given to one something they would not give to another" (Day's Work 25). The family's experience with unfair business made a lasting impression on Tarbell:

> At all events, uncomprehending as I was in that fine fight, there was born in me a hatred of privilege--privilege of any sort. It was all pretty hazy to be sure, but still it was well, at fifteen, to have one definite plank based on things seen and heard, ready for a future platform of social and economic justice if I should ever awake to my need of one. At the moment, however, my reflection did not carry me beyond the wrongness of the privilege which had so upset our world, contradicting as it did the principle of consideration for others which had always been basic in our family and religious teaching. (Day's Work 26)

---

[10] Franklin Tarbell participated in the 1872 Petroleum Producers' Union boycott against the region's railroads and the South Improvement Company, later Standard Oil. South Improvement had conspired with the railroads to obtain exclusive low shipping rates as well as a rebate on any shipping contracted by non-members of the combination (see Tarbell, Standard Oil I: 70-103).

In recounting this influential experience, Tarbell reveals the intersection of religious, political-social, and economic elements in her beliefs. Bruce J. Evensen, citing a paper by Tarbell on "My Religion," says that she valued Christianity for its basis in the "'brotherhood of man,'" a principle upon which she based her political beliefs as well (7). Her respect for the common bond of humanity informed her concept of democracy; her commitment to a dual principle of shared rights and consideration for others permeates her writings.

These early influences, along with socioeconomic circumstances and work experiences discussed in the next two subsections, explain much about the choices Tarbell made throughout her career. She retained her "passion for the microscope" and reflects in her autobiography that she would have liked to work in a laboratory, had such positions been available in the 1880s as those that had opened to women by the 1930s (Day's Work 62). While it is easy to imagine Tarbell initially accepting such a position, it is difficult, in light of the career she ended up making, to imagine that she would have remained content for long with sequestered study. By her own account, and evidenced repeatedly in her work, her passion for democratic fairness equaled her enthusiasm for scientific study. Each had a share in attracting her to journalism, by way of her ambivalence on the "woman question." The claims of women's rights activists both appealed to and assaulted her sense of fairness, a conflict which Tarbell planned to resolve, like the Christianity-Darwinism impasse, through scientific study.

Journalism as Social Research Put to Public Use

The story of Tarbell's start in journalism shows that these issues drew her from research for her own edification, toward writing for a public purpose. As an editorial assistant at The Chautauquan from 1882 to 1890, taken up further below, she learned journalistic skills and continued her education on many social issues that remained current throughout her life. She remarks that "in the decade of the eighties we were discussing and thinking about the same fundamentals that we are today [in the 1930s]" (Day's Work 83). Among these issues are the ones she grew up with--evolution theory, women's rights, and fair competition in business.[11]

While at The Chautauquan she began making notes toward a novel, of which she wrote three chapters before abandoning it for what she called, quoting from her diary, "'a more fundamental research'" into the "'Science of Society'" (Day's Work 84). Again, three chapters into the new work, she stopped, realizing that she "could not construct society as it was until [she] knew more about woman" (Day's Work 84). Tarbell was skeptical of the notion that men had fashioned the world; she "suspected [women] had played a larger part in shaping society" than anyone acknowledged. At the same time, she doubted the claim of some activists that, given the vote, women could improve society in ways that had eluded men (Day's Work 84). The research problem she identified was nothing

[11] She wrote extensively on the latter two of these, in magazine articles that she subsequently republished as books, including The Business of Being a Woman, Ways of Woman, New Ideals in Business, The Life of Elbert H. Gary: The Story of Steel, Owen D. Young: A New Type of Industrial Leader, and The Nationalizing of Business, 1878-1898.

less than to discover the proper role of women in society, to see if they had capabilities with which they were not generally credited. Her approach was to study women who had made public contributions in the past. Thus was her entry into history and biography. She began research on women of the French Revolution, which led her to archives in Paris, where she supported herself as a freelance journalist.

Kochersberger suggests that Tarbell's early journalism was akin to sociology (xxiv),[12] an apt comparison in regard to her method. In pointing out that Tarbell "skillfully used the tools of the sociologist and the journalist--observation, research, and interviewing" (xxiv), he echoes Schudson's observation of a common affinity for science among journalists of Tarbell's era. Many of them, including her colleague Ray Stannard Baker, shared an interest in Herbert Spencer's works, popular among educated readers in the latter half of the nineteenth century (Schudson, Discovering 72).[13] Tarbell writes that while she

---

[12] Kochersberger cites Paul J. Baker and Louis E. Anderson, Social Problems: A Critical Thinking Approach (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1987), 22: "Though they never mention her name, [these authors] seem to have been thinking about Ida Minerva Tarbell, when . . . they described journalism and sociology in reciprocal terms" (xxiv).

[13] Schudson notes that Baker "studied and imbibed Spencer's views on economy in literary style under Fred Newton Scott at Michigan Agricultural College" (72). Although the school is misidentified (Baker encountered Scott at the University of Michigan, where Baker went to study law after earning a bachelor's degree at Michigan Agricultural), Scott published an edition of Spencer's Philosophy of Style in 1892. While it is clear from Scott's introduction that he was familiar with much of Spencer's work, it is not clear whether he knew the works that Tarbell read. It would be difficult to speculate whether their ideas of Spencer coincided. However, Scott took a scientific approach to rhetorical study, as described in chapter two.

was reading Hugh Miller's work on evolution, she also began reading Herbert Spencer's articles in the Popular Science Monthly in 1872. Although she does not comment further, the articles by Spencer that year were part of a series entitled The Study of Sociology, published as a book in 1873. This series addresses, among other topics, problems of objective research and methods of overcoming them. If Spencer was the source of her method, Tarbell was a model student. Her emphasis on observable facts, often remarked upon by commentators on her work (Kochersberger; Miraldi, Muckraking and Objectivity 36; Fitzpatrick 25; Weinberg and Weinberg xix), follows Spencer's teachings.

Tarbell might very well have been at home in the academic field of sociology, with its utilitarian aim of addressing social problems. However, her scholarly ideal seems to have been what Laurence R. Veysey calls "pure research," the pursuit of knowledge as its own end--an ideal at odds with her strong sense of social responsibility. Tomkins describes Tarbell as experiencing a "tug of war between student and journalist," which ended with her agreement to write a quick biography of Napoleon for McClure's in 1893 (38). However, Tarbell seems to have struggled throughout her career to reconcile her own scholarly standards with the demands of deadline-driven journalism (Day's Work 100, 151-53, 159, 241, 253). Tomkins points out that in a 1939 interview, Tarbell said she would rather be called a "student of the times" than a "muckraker" (139). Granted, she never liked the derogatory term "muckraker" (Day's Work 242), but it seems significant that she did not simply propose "journalist" instead. With "student of the times," she struck a compromise between the scholar intent on

research and the journalist concerned with timely observation. The phrase captures the intellectual task of the rhetor, to be widely informed on matters of public concern, to understand the audiences and contexts of public discourse, to study intently the particular issues at hand.

Economic versus Rhetorical Autonomy

Tarbell's sense of social responsibility also contended with the need to earn a living--a tension found within many social institutions under capitalism. News organizations and educational institutions alike work at balancing interests of owners (or stockholders or trustees), rhetors (journalists or educators), and audiences (or students), with mixed results (Hachten, McChesney, Habermas, Veysey, Antczak, Antczak and Siemers). Writers, teachers, and speakers face similar, smaller-scale conflicts with supervisors and audiences. What will make money versus what will appeal to audiences or editors are sometimes markedly different matters. One concern is economic, the other rhetorical. In commercial journalism, rhetorical and economic concerns become enmeshed, though not necessarily to the exclusion of public opinion formation as depicted by Habermas in The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (discussed in chapter one). McClure's arguably could afford to pursue S. S. McClure's expensive idea of journalism because of the magazine's massive circulation. The American Magazine was not as fortunate; its history under John S. Phillips, Tarbell, and other colleagues who left McClure's in 1915 to buy the American shows a steady degradation of the journalists' authority (and rhetorical power) as the magazine

went from writer-direction to owner-direction under a series of takeovers (Semonche). Tarbell faced similar conflicts at the writer-editor level.

The tension between economic and rhetorical concerns arose from Tarbell's initial "platform," which included the "planks" of supporting herself and thus avoiding the entanglement of marriage.[14] Tarbell's ambition of self-support, influenced by the women's rights movement, as she suggests (Day's Work 34, 36), was also emblematic of women's presumed social and economic status as dependent upon others (parents or husbands) for subsistence. For a man to include this goal among his main ambitions would have been redundant; a man in Tarbell's position would have been expected to assume the responsibility of providing for himself and most likely a wife and children. For a woman of sufficient means to attend college as Tarbell did, aiming for economic independence ran decidedly counter to the norm--not to mention against beliefs she later articulated--and it was not an easy decision to execute. She often found herself accepting work that would pay the bills and hoping that it would also afford the time and money to pursue her vocation of scientific and social research. Sometimes her compromises were serendipitous, but not always.

Indicative of the precarious circumstances in which Tarbell's goal of economic self-sufficiency placed her is her experience with teaching, the one socially acceptable career in which she believed she could make a living. After

[14] The third plank was to gain an education. Tarbell amended her platform, after her "discovery of the Boy" (45-46) in college. Determined to "avoid entangling alliances of all kinds" she nevertheless enjoyed socializing with young men at Allegheny. By the time she graduated, she was willing to entertain the possibility of marrying "some day" (47), although she never did.

graduating from Allegheny College in 1880, she served as Preceptress of the Poland Union Seminary in Ohio, a secondary school with a combined college-preparatory and teacher-training curriculum. The free time she had hoped to spend there with her microscope never materialized. She taught a formidable schedule of two courses each in Greek, Latin, French, and German, one each in geology, botany, geometry, and trigonometry, and teachers' courses in arithmetic and grammar (Day's Work 51). Nor could she save money for future study. Most galling is her admission that she could not live on the salary and had to borrow from her father (Day's Work 53).

The economic challenges to Tarbell as a career woman were compounded at times by her principled agenda as a researcher and writer. The first piece she sold from France had little relation to her research. It was a short story, "France Adorée," based on her experiences with a French tutor in Pennsylvania before her journey abroad, which brought her $100 from Scribner's (Day's Work 98). At McClure's, she found an outlet for her public-minded biographical projects. A brief article on Paris life got her foot in the door at the magazine, where S. S. McClure accepted some of her biographic work as well and suggested a series on French women writers in line with her research agenda (Day's Work 100). In fact, under McClure's guidance, Tarbell arguably hit her stride as a rhetor (Tarbell, Day's Work 364; Tomkins 37-39). Reassessing her career ambitions at age 63, two of the issues to which she remained committed were those she first researched at McClure's suggestion: "privilege" or unfair competition in

business, and Lincoln's example of public leadership (Day's Work 360).[15] However, during her early association with McClure's, in the summer of 1893, after she had attracted the editor's attention and was contributing regularly to his fledgling magazine, she pawned her winter coat to make ends meet (Day's Work 141).

Much later, in the 1920s, after her careers at McClure's and the American, her first stints on the Chautauqua and lyceum lecture circuits, and her service on public commissions under Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Warren G. Harding (Day's Work 319-29; 375-76), Tarbell found herself adrift and in need of income.[16] To provide "an annual sure if modest money crop" (Day's Work 388), she returned to professional speaking, which she had deemed exhausting yet rewarding on her first circuit in 1916 (Day's Work 300-306; "A Little Look"). In her 60s and giving five speeches a week, she again found the work physically demanding but with apparently fewer intangible rewards--a "brutal, exhaustive business," she called it (Day's Work 388). At each location, the local speakers'

---

[15] The third issue was the prevention of war, which arose after she left McClure's (see Day's Work 360).

[16] In a chapter entitled "Gambling with Security," she tells of a trip she took in 1926 to report on fascist Italy under Mussolini (Day's Work 377-384). Despite ominous warnings from her friends, she accepted the assignment, because, as she put it, she "was offered so large a sum that [she] thought [she] could not afford to refuse" (378). Tarbell reports that her trip, which included an interview with Mussolini, proceeded without incident (382-84). Though Tarbell does not mention the magazine or resulting articles, McCall's magazine commissioned and published the series, "The Greatest Story in the World Today," from November 1926 through February 1927 (Brady 237-38, Tomkins 123-24). Tomkins finds the work "almost entirely favorable" to Mussolini.

bureau chairperson selected the topic from among six Tarbell offered, sometimes moments before she stepped on stage (Day's Work 388-91).

She attempts to cast these later lecture experiences in a positive light by including a brief description of her scenic travels, but her fatigue stands out, especially in an autobiography otherwise distinguished by its author's perseverance. She describes life on the lecture circuit as "lonesome," relating that she felt like "a detached wanderer, one who had laid aside personality and become a cog in the mechanism called a lecture bureau" (Day's Work 389). She adds, "My one ambition was to fill the specifications of the schedule and have it over with. It was not until I said goodbye to the last committee and was headed home that I felt the joyful rush of reviving personality" (Day's Work 389). Tarbell was perhaps as much disappointed as dispirited, considering her long-standing faith in the Chautauqua idea. In recounting her initial lecture experience, she says she saw the circuit as "a kind of peripatetic Chautauqua" and signed on, curious to "find out what this husky child of my old friend Chautauqua was like" (Day's Work 300). She maintained to the end that there was no better way than giving popular lectures to gain insight into the American people. Even so, her last impressions of the lecture circuits also seem a testament to the deleterious effects of commercialization on the popular-education ideals she had known and supported since her youth.[17]

[17] For discussions of these effects from a rhetorical perspective, see Antczak, 74-85, and Antczak and Seimers. Tarbell spoke on both lyceum and chautauqua circuits, beginning in 1916 and making an annual tour between 1920 and 1932. She briefly distinguishes the two in a passage that makes the lyceum sound a bit more entertainment-oriented. Whereas chautauquas presented speakers without introduction, she reports, lyceums "made the most of me, as a

Educating Citizens through Journalism

The Chautauqua movement had of course provided Tarbell's entrée to journalism as well as public speaking. In her work at The Chautauquan, Tarbell learned to practice a particular kind of journalism, one that sought to build and sustain a community of thoughtful citizens through education. Tomkins remarks that when Tarbell entered journalism, her new career "was still essentially that of a teacher" (24). In a way it remained so, for Tarbell's rhetorical career was largely one of educating citizens. The Chautauquan equipped Tarbell with excellent training and experience for such a career.

Established in 1880 to supplement the home-study program of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle, the magazine espoused values that Tarbell carried into subsequent work. Frederick J. Antczak notes that the lyceum and Chautauqua movements represented and addressed the "concept of 'self-interest, properly understood,' [which] achieved the status of popular dogma" in the Jacksonian era (Thought and Character 60-61). A blend of liberal-individualism and Christian morality, this American, egalitarian version of enlightened self-interest was envisioned as serving communal ends by encouraging self-development. "Self-interest, properly understood" thus promoted a highly civilized society of cultured individuals eager to contribute their best efforts in service of the greater good. This concept lay at the heart of personal character, as understood and cultivated by the influential leaders Burton

---

rule." The latter built up to her speech with introductions often riddled with error--to the point of crediting others' writings to her (Day's Work 391).

J. Bledstein calls "Mid-Victorians" (134-46), whose values provided a basis for the "culture of professionalism" discussed in chapter three.[18] Throughout her writings, Tarbell consistently represents this vision of the enlightened individual contributing to society.

Kochersberger aptly dubs Tarbell "The Chautauquan's legacy to American journalism" (xlviii). Though she was already well disposed to the Chautauqua mission, the possibility of doing journalistic work had not occurred to her when the opportunity arose in 1882. Offered a part-time job annotating the obscurer portions of academic texts for the magazine, she "jumped at the chance," envisioning a source of "pin money" that would allow ample time for her microscope. "[T]hat my future was in it, I did not dream," she writes (Day's Work 72). As a child she had enjoyed many summer Chautauquas with her family. Among the early women graduates of Allegheny College and the only one in her class,[19] she appreciated the Chautauqua idea of bringing a liberal arts

[18] Born in the 1830s and reaching maturity between 1865 and 1890 (53-54), this generation included university presidents James Burrill Angell of Michigan and Charles W. Eliot of Harvard. Bledstein identifies the next distinct generation as the Progressives, born in the 1860s and maturing between 1890 and 1915 (53). His book is an extended examination of the Mid-Victorian transformation of American culture and hence does not elaborate on Progressive views. However, Tarbell, born between these generations, fairly represents in her writings the Mid-Victorian ideas described by Bledstein; so does Fred Newton Scott. Focusing on the continuity provided by the Mid-Victorians and the professional culture they engendered, Bledstein offers some perspective on the increasing old-fashionedness of Tarbell and Scott as they entered the twentieth century.

[19] Allegheny began admitting women in 1870 and had graduated ten by the time Tarbell entered in 1876 (Camhi 149).

education and a "college outlook" to people--including many women--who had "missed a college education" (Day's Work 69-70).

If the idea of becoming a journalist had not yet occurred to Tarbell when she started at The Chautauquan, it assuredly had by the time she left. Tarbell's part-time position expanded to full-time as she found ways to be "useful" to the magazine. "Once in touch with the office of The Chautauquan I began to see things to do," she writes. The editor, "Dr. [Theodore L.] Flood had little interest in detail. . . . I could not keep my fingers off" (73). By way of explanation Tarbell generalizes, "A woman is a natural executive: that has been her business through the ages. Intuitively she picks up, sets to rights, establishes order" (73). In addition to creating order in the office, Tarbell learned the art of page makeup from the printer, and ensured that the copy provided to him was legible. Before long she was ghostwriting the editor's correspondence and columns such as the "Editor's Table" and "Editor's Note Book" (74-75). With "The Arts and Industries of Cincinnati," which appeared in December 1886, Tarbell forayed into article-writing. Describing both positive and negative impacts of various cultural diversions on public morality, the article reflects concerns that Tarbell continued to write about long afterward, as Tomkins notes (25). Tarbell cites "Women as Inventors," published in the March 1887 Chautauquan as her "most ambitious" early piece. Addressing woman's nature and her place in society, this article also features topoi to which Tarbell returned in later writings.

By this time Tarbell had formed sufficient ideas about journalism and a woman's potential in the profession to write "Women in Journalism," published

in The Chautauquan in April 1887. The article offers advice drawn from interviews with successful women journalists, and it reflects, but does not cite, its author's own experience. Tarbell avers, "No 'School of Journalism' can hope to furnish" the "qualities" required of a journalist (141), and yet her ideas about training for journalism coincide with those Fred Newton Scott expressed in "Training for Journalism," as discussed in chapter two. There were no "schools" of journalism at college level at this time (Robert E. Lee's school had already closed, in 1878, at Washington and Lee), although there was much debate in magazines and newspapers of the late 1880s over journalism training (O'Dell 38-46). By "School of Journalism," she may have had in mind the "commercial college type" of training that Scott argued against, for she, too, finds "indispensable" the general learning provided by college or "a broad and thoughtful course of reading" (141)--a prerequisite the Chautauqua home-study program would have met.

She also addresses rhetorical skills, prescribing a "good English style," a sign of "culture," which must be accompanied by accuracy and logic to be of any value (142). However, for Tarbell, as for Scott, writing skill was but one requirement of journalism, fairly dwarfed by other considerations. Tarbell warns, "Journalism is by no means purely literary work," and "[t]he halo which surrounds it is largely fictitious. Every department of the work has more or less drudgery connected with it" (139). She thus recommends developing what she calls the "power of growing" (143), which she explains by advising the prospective journalist to ask herself, "Can you thrive under drudgery?" (143).

This remark is reminiscent of Scott's reference to the "long, hard practice" required in mastering the art of journalism ("Training for Journalism," np). But Tarbell refers also to the details of editing and makeup involved in a small operation like that of The Chautauquan. She advises, "The woman who would become a journalist must fit into the organization wherever she is needed" (139), a remark echoed by her colleague Ray Stannard Baker in his account of his first days in the competitive profession of newspaper reporting (260-70). Tarbell's advice is surely informed as well by the struggle women faced in proving themselves "useful" as she and her interviewees had done, to win entrance into the male-dominated profession of journalism (Adams A Group; Beasley 5-20).[20]

Tarbell invokes journalism's power in democratic society, as does Scott, claiming that it "offers large opportunities for doing good, for influencing public opinion, and for purifying the atmosphere of the times" (140). In this regard, she says women journalists have the "power to establish the salon as an American social institution," and she gives examples of women who have gathered about them influential intellectual circles in New York and Washington (140-41).[21]

---

[20] While Baker's mention of "sticking type" at a rural newspaper seemed to impress the Chicago News Record city editor, Baker admits the editor's "gleam of encouragement would have been dimmed if he had known how little of that country newspaper I had had" (262). Baker writes that he started out as a stringer covering society weddings (264-66) and then coming up with what he calls "'pick-up'" stories, sketches of city life (291-93), neither of which paid enough to cover rent. After some time (he does not say how long), he began getting assignments, and finally was put on salary at the paper (291-300).

[21] Tarbell's examples are Mary Clemmer in Washington, DC, whose position is not named, and Mary Booth, editor of Harper's Bazaar, in New York.

This observation reflects her belief in the separate spheres of women and men, which she espoused consistently throughout her career.

Tarbell cites Thomas Wentworth Higginson, who notes a need for women as well as men who can provide "'general literary work of a solid and thoughtful nature, demanding both a scholarship and a trained power of expression'" ("Women in Journalism" 145). Tarbell's inclusion of this comment "clearly foreshadow[s] her subsequent career," as Tomkins remarks (30). In McClure's magazine, Tarbell found a receptive venue for the educational journalism she learned at The Chautauquan.

Calling Tarbell and her colleagues "a new breed of journalists," Tomkins advances an opinion widely shared among journalism historians, that McClure's combined "quality" writing with "mass" appeal and pricing. Such was S. S. McClure's "editorial genius," according to Tomkins (38). The Century was 35 cents, and McClure's sold for 15 cents, the same price as Munsey's Magazine, which Tomkins describes as "cheap alike in price and contents" (38). Tomkins finds McClure's "comparable" to, but "far less stodgy" than what Filler calls the "genteel publications"--magazines like the Century, Harper's Monthly, and the North American Review (Tomkins 38, Filler 110). Muckraking combined the approaches Schudson refers to as "story" and "information" journalism (Discovering 88-91; Miraldi, Muckraking and Objectivity 28; Filler 248). McClure favored an "information" approach, lavishing time and money on his reporters to get the facts (Tarbell, Day's Work 258). Tarbell and Steffens were the "scholars of the muckraking movement," according to one journalism critic

(qtd. in Weinberg and Weinberg xix). But McClure also insisted on providing entertaining material of timely interest to readers (Miraldi, Muckraking and Objectivity 41; Muckrakers 4-5). Tomkins accurately concludes, "McClure's offered Ida Tarbell the excitement of pioneering in a new field of journalism literally created by S. S. McClure, for which her previous experience ideally suited her" (38-39). The magazine afforded her an opportunity to use research to public ends.

READING TARBELL'S JOURNALISM AS RHETORIC

Studying Tarbell as a rhetor moves beyond the textual emphasis of literary-genre techniques, focusing instead on the public context of her work. Labels such as biographer, historian, novelist, and to some extent, muckraker or journalist, categorize writers in terms of genres defined largely by textual features related to style, content, or form. Historians and biographers, for instance, are distinguished from other nonfiction writers by the content of their works (past events, peoples' lives), and creative writers' works are distinguished from one another by form (poetry, drama, short story, novel). Journalists' works are distinguished from those of other nonfiction writers, such as historians, biographers, or essayists, by aspects of content (relation to current events). Journalists have also been granted or denied literary status by virtue of their works' form and style (narrative versus discursive; see Hartsock) or content (fact- versus idea-centered; see Kochersberger). Within journalism, written works are often distinguished from one another by combinations of textual characteristics (i.e., conventions of news-, editorial-, feature-, review-writing). Genre-based

distinctions like these foreground textual features, subordinating and potentially obscuring the context in which a text is produced and received.[22] Rhetorics of public discourse, on the other hand, are concerned primarily with context: to what end, for what purpose, for what audience, on what occasion, and by whom a text is composed or presented. In contrast to titles such as biographer or essayist, rhetor is linked not with a genre but with a public role, that of participating citizen, speaking or writing with the end of arriving at public judgments.

Literary and journalistic perspectives also tend to value writing for its timelessness or its timeliness, respectively, a dichotomy that in Tarbell's case has

---

[22] For the purposes of this discussion, I am generalizing simply about the matter of definition that I have raised--what we commonly mean when we say "journalism" or "biography," for example. The generalization does not apply so neatly to differences in literary and rhetorical criticism at large, especially since the demise of New Criticism, although I would argue that vestiges of the text-context conflict between literature and rhetoric remain. Literary and rhetorical approaches appear to be converging, with literary scholars increasingly addressing context and rhetoricians taking on issues of genre. However, literary treatments of context usually occur within a framework of cultural criticism, which focuses on interpretive strategy, usually with an end of instilling or defending particular aesthetic ideals (see Eberly, Citizen Critics 1, 18-19); cultural criticism within rhetoric shares this kind of interpretive focus and value-advancing aim (Cloud 14). In contrast, the rhetorical approach that I advocate here is concerned mainly with how discourse is used in the service of public ends--i.e., ends shared by a particular public in a particular time. Rhetoricians' recent attention to genre illustrates this context-based concern. For example, John Swales and Ann Johns use "genre" in a way that foregrounds context, especially in studies of academic and technical writing, which, like journalism, are traditionally bypassed by literary studies. These rhetorical considerations of genre differ from the formalistic approaches inspired by literary New Criticism in that they examine the social origins of generic textual features. Such studies are concerned with communication conventions as manifest within texts. They, too, might be said to investigate academic "cultures," but they are concerned with cultures of doing rather than cultures of appreciation.

the effect of separating into parts a body of work consistently concerned with improving public life. Rhetoric offers a way out of this dilemma as well. The literary perspective offered by Kochersberger encourages an appreciation of the universal appeal of Tarbell's work, which de-emphasizes its more immediate value as public discourse. Viewing Tarbell as a Progressive-era muckraker has a nearly opposite effect. While placing her in the context of publics moved to enact social, political, and industrial reforms, focusing on Tarbell's muckraking nevertheless de-emphasizes other publicly significant work she did. The Progressive era coincided with only a decade and a half of Tarbell's career. What are we to make of her other four decades or so in public life? Though traditionally most concerned with timely judgments, rhetoric does not exclude from its purview pronouncements on timeless topics; rather, it provides a framework for considering them within the contexts of particular, immediate public problems. As discussed in chapter one, Aristotle's topoi, recurring topics or strategies of argument, were integral to his system of rhetoric, because they provided starting points, organizing principles, and lines of argument for a speech. Topoi can introduce enduring issues into discussion of current exigencies. Locating and analyzing recurring topoi related to citizenship and democracy in Tarbell's writing enables a holistic critique of her muckraking and other works of public discourse.

Finally, rhetoric represents a system equally useful for critiquing and producing public discourse that overcomes the fact-value binary of twentieth-century journalism. Common versions of this binary include oppositional

treatments of fact versus opinion, story versus information, and subjectivity versus objectivity, which journalists recently have found problematic (Miraldi, Muckraking and Objectivity; Rosen, "Beyond Objectivity;" J. Campbell, Carey, "Community, Public, and Journalism"). Stasis theory, based on Hermagoras's classification of stages through which a court case progresses toward a judgment, provides a basis for viewing journalistic writings as arguments. Even the "straight news" story makes an argument at the stasis of fact, providing evidence chosen to convince the audience that an event happened under certain circumstances (the "who, what, when, where, why, and how" of news). If one views journalistic writing as argument, evaluation can proceed on the contextual basis of whether evidence is appropriate, sufficient, and fairly presented in the given situation, rather than whether the evidence meets an elusive inherent standard such as being emotion-free or a "true" depiction of "reality." Aristotle's rhetorical pisteis, "artistic proofs" achieved by appeals to reason (logos), the speaker's character (ethos), and the audience's emotions and values (pathos), provide alternatives to the fact-value dichotomy at the heart of journalism's problematic notion of objectivity. Whereas in twentieth-century objective journalism logos tends to subsume pathos and ethos, rhetoricians generally assume that a combination of appeals is most effective in persuading a general audience.

From a rhetorical perspective, Tarbell's muckraking represents the implicit advocacy of epideictic rhetoric, which prepares potential publics for action, rather than the explicit advocacy of deliberative rhetoric, which proposes

specific action. This viewpoint illuminates the subjectivity-forming function of muckraking, which is typically seen as action-oriented or activist, and the potential power inherent in epideictic rhetoric as technē, an art of intervention and invention.[23] Comparing Tarbell's muckraking with some of her post-muckraking journalism on the woman question--which is also epideictic rhetoric with interventionist public aims--illustrates the potential for rhetoric as technē to serve social or political ends ranging from dynamic and order-disrupting to static and order-preserving.[24] This analysis helps reconcile apparent conflicts among Tarbell's more and less activist writings and between her opinions on woman's role and her actions as a public figure.

Muckraking as Epideictic Rhetoric

The History of the Standard Oil Company is considered a classic example of muckraking, a journalistic genre referred to as "the literature of exposure" (Weinberg and Weinberg xv) and as a precursor to mid-twentieth century investigative reporting (Fitzgerald 3; Miraldi, Muckraking and Objectivity 5). Robert Miraldi identifies muckraking articles as "compilations of documented fact that lead to an indictment--of individuals or institutions" (Muckraking and

[23] This reading of Tarbell's muckraking supports arguments of Gerard A. Hauser ("Aristotle on Epideictic," Vernacular Voices) and others, who refute the idea that epideictic is merely a rhetoric of display, positing instead that it contributes to public-opinion formation.

[24] I borrow the general idea of this scheme from Leon Bramson, The Political Context of Sociology. Although sociology generally seeks social order, Bramson identifies static and dynamic theories within the field. Sociologies of "conservation" seek to preserve existing social orders, whereas sociologies of "change" work toward social reconstruction.

Objectivity 18). The key elements are "detailed, factual exposure" and "indictment." Muckraking is "not explicit advocacy," he notes, although it is "inevitably non-neutral" and "exhorts" implicitly (Muckraking and Objectivity 17-18). Rhetorically, then, muckraking argues explicitly at the stases of fact and value, and implicitly at the stases of policy and procedure. Muckraking is also primarily epideictic rather than deliberative or forensic rhetoric. Furthermore, as an epideictic of blame, muckraking may merely imply the desirable standards it seeks to encourage. Louis Filler observes that Tarbell's history of Standard Oil "implicitly--but only implicitly--defined attributes proper to legitimate business in modern times" (247). This description holds true as well for The Tariff in Our Times, Tarbell's other major muckraking series.[25]

Published from 1902 through 1904 in McClure's magazine and immediately re-printed by Macmillan as a two-volume book, the Standard Oil series is as much history as exposé, as Tarbell maintained. "I had hoped that the book might be received as a legitimate historical study," she writes, "but to my chagrin I found myself included in a new school, that of the muckrakers" (Day's Work 241). That Standard Oil was a monopoly was not new information--it was indeed history. The company had faced trial in state and federal courts, and it

[25] The tariff history mentions standards to which Tarbell would have businesses strive but only in passing. In later works, such as New Ideals in Business: An Account of Their Practice and Their Effects upon Men and Profits and her biographies of Elbert H. Gary and Owen D. Young, she explicitly argues for ideals of enlightened leadership in business. These books, too, represent epideictic rhetoric in that they primarily present models of praiseworthy character for generalized application, rather than arguing for enactment of policy in particular situations.

figured as the central antagonist in Henry Demarest Lloyd's 1894 treatise, Wealth against Commonwealth. But Tarbell exposed the company's character more fully by providing new details to a general audience of some 400,000 readers. Tarbell consulted thousands of pages of Congressional and court documents, some of them manuscripts. She recognized that while technically "public," these records were all but inaccessible to most Americans. She also tracked down copies of records that Standard Oil had attempted to destroy, and she conducted interviews with many figures in the oil industry (Tarbell, Day's Work 206-16; Fitzgerald 7, 25).

Clearly the work is both history and muckraking, but it is also an example of rhetoric as an art of intervention and invention. Muckrakers expose and blame, under the optimistic assumption (well founded or not) that their efforts will effect change (Miraldi, Muckraking and Objectivity 11). The interventionist character of muckraking is evident in contrast to later "objective" reporting. Miraldi summarizes the difference in reporters' assumed stances: "Objectivity observes; muckraking intrudes" (Muckraking and Objectivity 10). According to Tarbell, with the Standard Oil series she and her colleagues at McClure's sought to intervene in the status quo. Trusts had become increasingly prevalent since the Spanish-American War, in spite of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act passed in 1890 (Tarbell, Day's Work 202). "Was [the law] quite useless?" Tarbell asks. "It looked that way" (Day's Work 202). The author comments that as a historical work, the series seemed a "doubtful enterprise for a magazine like McClure's" (Tarbell, Day's Work 206), but from the beginning the story's concept was to

address the issue of trusts. There was no better (or worse) example to be found than Standard Oil (Tarbell, Day's Work 202; Standard Oil ix). In the book's preface Tarbell states that with this series McClure's magazine set out to provide its readers with "a clear and succinct notion of the processes by which a particular industry passes from the control of the many to that of the few" (ix). This topos of democratic fairness animates many of Tarbell's works.

The Standard Oil series, like much muckraking, is epideictic in that it presents an example of blameworthy public conduct. This work and The Tariff in Our Times, a series of articles published intermittently from 1906 through 1911 in The American Magazine and issued as a book in 1911, comprise Tarbell's "main contribution to the muckraking movement," as Tomkins notes (100). Like the Standard Oil Series, The Tariff in Our Times criticizes business for thwarting the law to obtain unfair advantages, cheating not only competitors but also the public at large. The history of Standard Oil exposes one company conspiring directly against its US competitors, in part by manipulating public transportation resources (railroads). The tariff history exposes organized business interests (trusts and early lobbies) conspiring to curb foreign competition, thereby protecting their own high prices and profits, by manipulating the legislative system.

Like the Standard Oil series, the tariff work is history, but the latter constitutes more of a classic exposé in that it revealed new information to the public. While Standard Oil was already notorious when Tarbell wrote about it, "tariff manipulation was done in the dark," and few people knew of it (Tomkins 98-99). The book's thesis, stated in the preface, is "that as far as the tariff is

concerned the public opinion has never been fairly embodied in the bills adopted" (vii). The book represents "an attempt to tell in narrative form the story of this defeat of the popular will" (vii). Tarbell assumes that legislators' stated justifications of tariff bills--i.e., to assist in establishing new industries in the United States or to pay off war debts--represented "popular will." As Tarbell addressed her audience, she invoked this very public authority that resided in them, inviting them to see themselves as constituents wronged in a series of corrupt public acts.

Epideictic Rhetoric's Public-Building Potential

Thus in the Standard Oil and tariff histories, Tarbell invokes her audience's authority as citizens, with the implied intention of moving them to action as a public. Both series argue primarily at the stases of fact and value, amassing evidence of the contempt of big business for little business, individuals, and democratic processes. Both works are characterized by the detailed accumulation of fact for which Tarbell is known, and thus resemble forensic rhetoric, which accuses or defends by producing evidence of past events. However, the point of Tarbell's muckraking is not literal (legal) indictment but figurative indictment. The court in which she tried Standard Oil and tariff-protected industries was the counterfactual one of "public opinion." To return to Aristotle's contextual distinction, the hearers of an argument determine its "end and object" (Rhetoric I.3, 1358b1). Tarbell brought businesses to judgment before the public at large, not a specific jury or judge empowered to exact punishment. Her muckraking is epideictic in its function as rhetoric addressed to

"inchoate publics," as Eberly calls people who are considering the concerns they potentially share with others ("From Writers" 169). Tarbell's work implies an audience consisting of people she presumes might be awakened to the fact that they share with others some consequences of these businesses' actions. Recognizing their commonality, they could deliberate together about what to do and even take collective action as hybrid or strong publics (depending on their authority to enact change), in Fraser's terms (discussed in chapter one).

Here I am suggesting that Tarbell's muckraking invites audience members to see themselves as potential members of a public with reason and agency to act collectively. In some of her other writings I will point to ways in which she invites audience members to adopt a quality or a character, which involves individual action with social consequences but might not reach the point of conjoint action. In other words, Tarbell's rhetoric consistently invokes public-mindedness; at times it invokes publics, preparing readers for collective deliberation and action, and at other times it invokes individual citizens, exhorting readers to individual action (or behavior) aimed at social or political ends. Muckraking seems especially well suited to invoking publics, because of the specificity of its blame; it directs attention to particular cases of wrongdoing, locating not only the culprits but also the wronged parties, the latter often potential publics. However, as Tarbell's writing shows, among journalistic genres muckraking does not have exclusive claim to the invocation of publics. While Tarbell's muckraking invokes publics more consistently than does her non-muckraking journalism, instances of public- and citizen-invocation can be found

throughout her writings. Likewise, her muckraking invokes citizens as well as publics.

I derive this concept of invoking publics and citizens in rhetoric from several sources besides Aristotle, Eberly, and Fraser, mentioned above. The terms, audiences "addressed" and "invoked," are from an article by Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford--which includes a useful review of some of the literature--but the concept I have outlined is informed more directly by sources in rhetorical criticism. In analyzing the audiences invoked by Tarbell, I refer to what Edwin Black identifies as the "second persona" of a speech. This rhetorical construct is the implied auditor, or the "model of what the rhetor would have his [or her] real auditor become" (113). Black sees this element, conveyed through the speaker's language and attitudes, as a basis upon which a critic may make moral judgments about a speech. Philip C. Wander objects to this critical method, as do I, because it removes the speech from the context that gives it meaning. Nevertheless, Black's premise remains valid, that in "all rhetorical discourse, we can find enticements not simply to believe something, but to <u>be</u> something" (119). Wander posits a "third persona," or an audience "negated" by the speech. In addition he points out that the second-persona "invitation to be" also implies an "invitation to act," in that the audience decides "here and now" whether to accept or decline (209). This implicit invitation to act suggests the impetus that I locate as central to the rhetorical invocation of citizens and publics.

The dynamic at work in such invocation, the unspoken dialectic between rhetor and each audience member, is that effecting "identification," or

"consubstantiality," as described by Kenneth Burke (Rhetoric 19-21; 55-56). Burke uses these two terms interchangeably to describe the persuasive force in rhetoric. Successful rhetoric enables the rhetor and the audience to become "consubstantial," to recognize or come to believe that they share the "substance" of ideas, attitudes, opinions, or beliefs. Consubstantiality also implies shared "interests." To the extent that the reader or auditor "identifies" with the rhetor's interests, the rhetor succeeds in persuading.

Frederick J. Antczak uses this idea, along with Wayne C. Booth's concept of "selves" being "taken in" during rhetorical exchange, to describe a process of rhetorical "reconstitution" that affects both rhetor and audience (Antczak, Thought and Character). Both parties readjust their thinking--the rhetor in order to reach the audience, the audience in order to grasp the rhetor's message--and to some degree, their characters change in this process. Antczak uses this concept to analyze the function of lyceum speeches in educating a democratic citizenry. Similarly I use the concept of invoked audiences to analyze the potential roles of Tarbell's journalism in forming publics and public opinion. Tarbell invokes citizens, inviting her audience to "be"--to acquire "thought and character" or to act individually--in ways consistent with her vision of democratic citizenship. At times, she invokes publics, inviting audience members to "act," collectively; in this instance they are asked not only to see themselves in the summoned "second persona" but to identify with (in the Burkean sense) a multitude of other citizens whose interests they share.

Progressive Muckrakers and their Audiences

This rhetorical analysis refutes the "confusions" Miraldi finds in muckraking, between objectivity and partisanship, "argument and literature," and ultimately between journalists and their audiences (Muckraking and Objectivity 41). Miraldi avers that "journalism was halfway between where it had been and where it was going," as reporters of the Progressive era had one foot in the past and one in the future in terms of professional practices (Muckraking and Objectivity 31). His observations on the transitional position of muckraking is astute, but he leaps to the questionable conclusion that journalists and their audiences were consequently befuddled about the function of journalism. Progressive muckrakers "were indeed confused about what role they should play," he says, and "journalism must have seemed confused" to readers as well (Muckraking and Objectivity 31). This claim underestimates journalists and their audiences at once, from a perspective that privileges the twentieth-century objective journalism that Miraldi himself seeks to reform.

Miraldi explains that while objectivity had not yet emerged as a norm in mainstream journalism, muckrakers often exhibited signs of "fledgling objectivity": a penchant for thoroughness and fact-finding, heavy reliance on government documents, and a concern with balanced presentation of opposing views (Muckraking and Objectivity 32-36). They simultaneously displayed "anti-objectivity" tendencies, such as use of first-person narrative and assertion of authorial opinion (Muckraking and Objectivity 36-41). Furthermore they injected "literary" story-telling elements into their articles, sometimes even fictionalizing

events and inventing dialogue (Muckraking and Objectivity 41-46). Although these combinations were not countenanced in later objective journalism, Progressive reporting was not necessarily confused; from a rhetorical perspective, it blended arguments of fact and value toward evaluative and ultimately action-oriented ends.

In the atmosphere of the Progressive era, which Miraldi and others describe as permeated with optimistic reform-mindedness, muckrakers and their audiences, far from confused, appear to have shared a strong sense of public purpose. Tarbell had reason to expect that members of her audience would convene and act on the issues she raised. Miraldi argues--somewhat contrary to his confused-journalism claim--that muckrakers not only reflected the reformist currents of the times, but they also represented values and beliefs common among the vast middle-class readership they sought to engage (Muckraking and Objectivity 27-28). They could draw on these values, as Tarbell did, to establish an ethos that would lend authority to their arguments. Miraldi errs in supposing that Progressive-era audiences would be "confused" rather than impressed by inclusion of ethical and pathetic appeals that transcended the realm of verifiable fact. As he acknowledges, the expectation of value-free objectivity had not yet developed in journalism, so journalism's credibility likewise did not depend upon the obscuring of the author behind facts. As Miraldi points out, Progressive muckrakers were "free" to be "activist" and "creative" in ways that eluded their successors under the strictures of objectivity (Muckraking and Objectivity 49). Another way to see this difference is that muckraking made fuller use of appeals

to pathos, logos, and ethos than did later objective reporting; in the latter, logos effectively came to stand in for ethos and pathos as well.[26]

Journalism historians describe complementary relationships between Progressive reform efforts and muckraking that further support the reading of Tarbell's epideictic reporting as oriented toward public-opinion formation in anticipation of subsequent action. According to Filler, muckraking was "linked to programs for action," undertaken by civic organizations, "societies, presses, schools, and institutes, which would bring together like-minded philanthropic and socially alive men and women" (262). Arthur and Lila Weinberg depict muckraking as stirring sentiment and providing a factual basis for reform efforts. Journalists "spotlighted Progressivism," and provided "impetus" for legislative reform (Weinberg and Weinberg xviii). Highlighting the rhetorical process that powers public action, the Weinbergs add, "There was a need for aggressive and sensational measures. This is where the muckrakers were important. There can be no intelligent discussion or action unless there are facts; the muckrakers furnished the facts and made them alive for a reading public" (xviii). Bringing the facts "alive" helped move the audience to action. The Weinbergs cite Filler on the muckrakers' part in nurturing the "'reforming zeal'" of the era (qtd. in

---

[26] This point deserves further consideration, and would provide ample material for another study. To clarify briefly, though, consider the standard, objective twentieth-century news story, often appearing with no byline. The absent author achieves credibility by appeals to impersonal facts and reason. Similarly, the "news values" that comprise the news story's primary pathetic appeal ("this is worth your attention") are also based on facts--timeliness of the event (when), prominence of the persons involved (who), unusualness of the event (what), etc.

Weinberg and Weinberg xviii), a reference to the emotional element in rhetoric, pathos, which moves people to care about and perhaps to act on an issue.[27]

Tarbell's Muckraking: Invoking Publics and Citizens

While leaders in business and government avidly followed Tarbell's reporting,[28] much of her audience consisted of common citizens who comprised the majority of McClure's readership. With "common" or "ordinary" citizens versus "leaders" or "officials," I invoke a distinction that grew pronounced in the professional culture described in chapter three. As Schudson and Bledstein both suggest, the effects of professionalization in various fields were at once seemingly democratic, ostensibly offering opportunity for advancement to anyone who could attain the requisite expertise (usually through college), and exclusionary, producing a wide disparity in power between the experts and nonexperts in any given field. In the arena of politics--a field of action concerned with public life itself and thus of interest to all constitutents of a given public--the exclusionary aspects of professionalism are especially problematic. As Schudson shows, the "informed citizen," which arose amid professionalization and Progressive reforms, is a demanding standard of citizenship that requires continually renewed

---

[27] They refer to Filler's Crusaders for American Liberalism, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1930, III: 406.

[28] Reactions of John D. Rockefeller and Theodore Roosevelt, among others, illustrate such interest (Tarbell, Day's Work 239-42; Weinberg and Weinberg xvi-xvii, 56-57). In the explanation I give in this paragraph of "ordinary" citizens versus political leaders, Rockefeller and other business leaders were not members of the official political leadership. But Rockefeller and those whom Tarbell writes about in The Tariff in Our Times assumed political roles in forming monopolies and trusts, through which they attained privileges unavailable to their ordinary-citizen competitors in business.

expert knowledge--knowledge of the type that could be supplied by newly professionalized journalists. The "ordinary" citizens Tarbell addressed were perhaps reading her work in an effort to be "informed;" they were thus potential participants in public life.

These ordinary citizens, or aspiring informed citizens, were the people Tarbell wished to rouse, those to whom she addressed herself most pointedly. Her epideictic muckraking invokes publics and citizens in at least three ways. One is by providing praiseworthy examples of ordinary citizens engaging in conjoint action. Another is by evoking a sense of injustice toward the common citizen or the public at large in the actions of big business, implicating the audience as potential plaintiffs (individually or as a public) in the indictments. A third is by appealing to principles of public life valued by the audience, such as that of democratic fairness, which Tarbell assumes her readers share. All three of these elements figure in Tarbell's treatment of the independent oil producers' fight against Standard Oil.

As an example of the anti-democratic "processes by which a particular industry passes from the control of the many to that of the few" (Tarbell, History ix), the Standard Oil history features the independent oil producers, representing the "many," in a struggle against Standard Oil's leaders, representing "the few." In the oft-anthologized third installment, "The Oil War of 1872," Tarbell presents the organized efforts of "[p]roducers, brokers, refiners, drillers, [and] pumpers" (Standard Oil I: 71) against John D. Rockefeller's South Improvement Company (Standard Oil in an early guise), after they discover that the company negotiated

special low shipping rates with the Pennsylvania Railroad (and other railroads, as they later found). Tarbell recounts the independents' formation of the Petroleum Producers' Union, and its subsequent actions. The organization conducts meetings, petitions the Pennsylvania legislature, establishes a committee to confront the South Improvement Company and the railroads, and coordinates blockades against the companies in league with South Improvement. The independent producers prevail over the South Improvement Company by getting the railroads to dissolve their contracts with the company (Tarbell, Standard Oil I: 70-103).

At one point the Producers' Union declines an offer from the railroads to grant its affiliates a rate arrangement similar to that enjoyed by South Improvement. In relating this incident Tarbell clearly presents the independents as exemplars of a public moved to defend democratic ideals:

> It seemed impossible to the railroad men that the oil men really meant what they said and would make no terms save on the basis of no discriminations of any kind to anybody. . . . They failed utterly at first to comprehend that the Oil War of 1872 was an uprising against an injustice, and that the moral wrong of the thing had taken so deep a hold of the oil country that the people as a whole had combined to restore right. (I: 91-92)

The Producers' Union's refusal to accept special shipping rates is crucial for Tarbell. Their fight for the right to compete fairly is what distinguishes them from the companies that join in the South Improvement scheme to manipulate

public resources--in this case, the railroads, and later also the legislative system (II: 111-128).[29]

In subsequent articles, Tarbell follows this public of independent producers as its fortunes rise and fall. The organization fails in a new fight against Standard Oil, disbands, then reconvenes and brings suit against the company. In the end, the Standard breaks into divisions (ostensibly independent companies as ordered by the Attorney General of Ohio), moves its headquarters to New Jersey, and proceeds fairly much as usual, forcing competitors to sell or go out of business. The independents did not effect revolutionary change, but Tarbell, who was not enamored of revolution as Tomkins' readings of her works show, finds reasons to applaud their actions. For one thing, the independents achieved success in principle; she suggests that they did what they had to do as self-respecting citizens standing up for their democratic rights. For another, they achieved some tangible success in the realm of democratic procedure by directing

[29] I would add that this democratic principle that Tarbell locates in the producers' struggle is what identifies the group as a public rather than simply an interest group. Publics form around issues of common concern--or common interests--but not all efforts to advance collective interests are evidence of publics, understood as components of democracy. Hauser points out that "there is a difference between partisan urgings, in which responsiveness to the other side and the possibility of being persuaded are assumed, and the manipulation of propaganda, in which those who are vested become closed to persuasion. . . . As a public sphere becomes preoccupied with influencing others by manipulation and propaganda rather than with arriving at a balanced judgment through informed deliberation, the public sphere becomes distorted" (Vernacular Voices 80). Tarbell argues that the South Improvement Company, and its successor, Standard Oil, used manipulation and subterfuge to gain advantage covertly; she presents the Producers' Union as using rhetoric to achieve its ends, laying open its claims and proceedings to public participation and scrutiny.

court attention to their issues and contributing to the incremental changes that constitute reform.

Tarbell celebrates these successes in the penultimate installment. She pauses to reflect: "Again and again in the history of the oil business it has looked to the outsider as if henceforth Mr. Rockefeller would have to have things his own way, for who was there to interfere with him, to dispute his position?" (II: 254). Her answer is independents, like those of "Northwestern Pennsylvania, in scrubby little oil towns, around greasy derricks, in dingy shanties, by rusty, deserted oil stills"--men (invariably in this account) who recognize "the injustice of restraint of trade, the dangers of monopoly, the right to do an independent business. . ." (II: 255). Lest struggle should appear "futile" against "the splendid rehearsal of figures, and the unctuous logic of the Mother of Trusts," she reminds her readers, with an unfortunately unflattering analogy, "It was the squawking of geese that saved the Capitol." She summarizes the producers' collective achievements and ends the installment in a positive tone: "Certain it is, . . . that all of competition which we have with its consequent lowering of prices, is due to independent efforts" (II: 255). Her "history" of Standard Oil is as much an epideictic of praise for the public that fought the monopoly as it is an epideictic of blame against the "Mother of Trusts." This praiseworthy public consisted of ordinary citizens fighting for common democratic values. Such an effort, Tarbell implies, is well within reach of her audience.

The Tariff in Our Times shows consumers, workers, families, and the US public at large as victims of avaricious capitalists' indifference to their rights.

The protagonists are the legislators who fight to eliminate or reduce protective tariffs. Nevertheless, she invokes her readers' public-forming potential in this work by implicating them as plaintiffs in her indictment against tariff-protected industries and the legislators who maintain tariffs. The series recounts the negotiations and contexts for tariff bills from the Civil War era to the time of Tarbell's writing, providing evidence that tariffs benefit the few (owners, stockholders) at the expense of the many (laborers, middle-class consumers). In the eleventh of thirteen chapters, "Where Every Penny Counts," Tarbell vividly demonstrates the effects of tariffs on American consumers, inviting her audience to identify with the vast public of consumers, wronged by capitalists and Congress alike.

Early in the article Tarbell poses the question, "What is a cent to a consumer?" She proceeds to sketch an outline of the public affected by tariff-generated increases in consumer prices. She cites population and income figures that disallow her well-off readers any delusions that they are average, while also showing the penny-counting readers they are far from alone. Among 92 million people in the country, she estimates "a few thousand" are millionaires, and "perhaps a few hundred thousand" make $10,000 or more a year (259). "But in contrast to them there are millions of individuals whose wage is under a thousand," she surmises. The United States Steel Trust provides her a ready example from which to extrapolate: "According to its last report the average wage of its 195,500 employees, including its foremen and clerks and managers, whose salaries in some cases are $10,000 even $25,000 a year, was but $775"

(259). Average incomes for a few other industries allow her to conclude that "probably several millions of white families" live on $500 or less a year. The adjective "white" is a disturbing indicator that Tarbell must have assumed a primarily white audience who would be duly shocked to know that their own kind were scraping to get by--in other words, Tarbell shared their prejudice, as we would see it today. Blacks and other non-whites would be "third persona" audiences negated by this rhetoric. And yet the comment also indicates she was not going to allow the misconception that perhaps the income averages were lowered by former slaves' descendants who had not yet struggled out of poverty.

By the same token, the length to which Tarbell goes to explain the economic circumstances for the majority of Americans suggests that she assumed a fair number of her readers were closer to the $10,000 than the $500 salary range. Even so she manages to conjure an American society in which the rule, not the exception, is the condition of pursuing "a thrift which frequently is hateful, it is so cruel," in order to survive now and save for the future (259). "This is the hard fact," Tarbell states, "and yet the Congress of the United States for fifty years has fixed taxes on the food and clothing and shelter of these people with no apparent consciousness of their condition" (259-60). (Again, "these people" suggests the worst-off are not in the audience she imagines herself addressing.) Tarbell implies that regardless of income, though, her readers should be outraged by the sheer injustice of Congress' disregard for the majority of the people. Virtually everyone outside the small circle of perpetrators is implicated as sharing, materially or ethically, in the consequences of the events she has

related; the implicit message is that the audience should act as a public on this knowledge.

The tariff history overall makes compelling arguments that protective tariffs, far from serving their originally stated purposes as temporary means of encouraging new industry or of repaying war debts, have been continuously extended at the behest of particular industries, and at considerable detriment to the nation as a whole. Some of the ill effects fall in the realm of people's material well-being, some in the intellectual realm, and some in the moral realm (Tariff 357). Significantly, Tarbell reserves her strongest criticism for the last category, the moral damages she attributes to tariffs. Ultimately her prime concern is the individual moral character afforded by politics and society; her vision of democracy is unmistakably liberal, in its insistence on the primacy of the individual.

Tarbell recapitulates her main arguments in the last chapter, "Some Intellectual and Moral Aspects of Our Tariff-Making." Tariffs, she says, drive up the cost of living without similarly increasing incomes for the majority, and they cultivate trusts and monopolies, encouraging businesses to combine in order to gain favor with legislators. Tariffs abuse the "American laborer," whom tariff proponents disingenuously proclaim to protect. Tariffs lower the intellectual level of politics, reducing the legislative system of compromise to bargaining over favors rather than negotiation over principles. Worst of all, tariffs foster a deadening of moral sensibilities, evidenced in their encouragement of blatant disregard for others' welfare, their perpetuation of low standards in the quality of

goods, their corruption of democratic processes. In this final article she presents two blameworthy examples of the moral harm wrought by tariffs. One is the "tariff-made state," the other the "tariff-made man." Tarbell's summaries of these archetypes are worth quoting, because they express clearly her criticism of the anti-democratic, anti-liberal tendencies she sees in tariff legislation.

Tarbell's example of the tariff-made state is Rhode Island, whose Senator Nelson W. Aldrich co-authored the Payne-Aldrich Bill of 1909, enacting a host of tariffs. Introducing her well-chosen example, Tarbell presents a rare flash of humor: "Rhode Island is one of the most perfect object-lessons in the effects of high tariffs in this or any land. An object-lesson should not be overlarge (336).[30] After twelve pages recounting Rhode Island's agriculture, industry, capital, and labor--pre- and post-tariffs--Tarbell presents this summary excoriation:

> This, then, is high protection's most perfect work--a state of a half million people turning out an annual product worth $279,438,000, the laborers in the chief industry underpaid, unstable, and bent with disease, the average employers rich, self-satisfied, and as indifferent to social obligation as so many robber barons. It is an industrial oligarchy made by a nation's beneficence under the mistaken notion that it was working out a labor's paradise. Not only is it a travesty of the principles of protection, it is a mockery of that very individualism behind which it takes refuge.

---

[30] Tarbell also exhibits a lack of facility with language ("most perfect") and a tendency to overwrite (she goes on for another two sentences beyond those quoted). Tomkins finds traits like these, along with the timeboundedness of much of her work, prevent Tarbell from being a "great" writer (25, 158). Both are symptomatic of journalism, which, to achieve timeliness, is often hastily produced; all the more reason to "appreciate" journalism rhetorically rather than through the aesthetic judgments of literary criticism. As Tomkins concedes, Tarbell achieved clarity in dealing with complex issues, as well as the elusive quality of sprezzatura, a "lucidity in her prose which paradoxically conceals beneath its very transparency the intelligence and the workmanship that make it possible" (25, 158).

> Individualism does not thrive at the expense of its fellows: it appreciates that the very kernel of its own existence lies in respecting and defending the rights of others. As for democracy, what vestige of it is left in either the political or industrial machine which controls the state of Rhode Island? (349)

With the next-to-last sentence Tarbell offers the counterexample, the ideal that ought to be upheld but is not in this case. The most egregious effects of tariffs, in Tarbell's view, are that they thwart democracy, thus subverting a state's ability to foster individual initiative.

The example of the tariff-made man is a composite type drawn from allusions to many of the players presented in previous chapters. Again, Tarbell emphasizes liberal individualism as the chief principle that democracy serves:

> This, then, is the kind of man the protective system as we practise [sic] it encourages: a man unwilling to take his chances in a free world-struggle; a man whose sense of propriety and loyalty has been so perverted that he is willing to treat the Congress of the United States as an adjunct to his business; one who regards freedom of speech as a menace and the quality of his product of less importance than the quantity; one whose whole duty toward his working-man is covered by a pay envelope. This man at every point is a contradiction to the democratic ideal of manhood. The sturdy self-reliance, the quick response to the ideals of free self-government, the unwillingness to restrain the other man, to hamper his opportunity or sap his resources, all of these fine things have gone out of him. He is an unsound democratic product, a very good type of the creature that privilege has always produced. (360-361).

Here, too, she provides a counterexample, in the next-to-last sentence, describing the "democratic ideal of manhood," which this article invokes in its audience. She assumes her readers will agree that "sturdy self-reliance" and respect for fair competition are traits worthy of emulation as well as norms the government should encourage rather than thwart. One way to do so, this work suggests, is to

act as a public to end protective tariffs, but clearly another, more immediate way is for each citizen to emulate the "democratic ideal of manhood."

An Epideictic of Women's Citizenship

The word "manhood" gives pause: Was Tarbell advocating an ideal of citizenship for men only or women, too? Like most writers of her era, she routinely uses male pronouns in non-gender-specific cases--a particularly disarming practice in a piece such as "Women in Journalism," in which she writes exclusively of women but uses "he" to refer to "the journalist." Hence, her "ideal of manhood" could be read as applicable to women as well as men; indeed in The Business of Being a Woman, discussed next, she urges a very similar ideal for women. The ambiguity of her pronoun usage makes it difficult to say with certainty that Tarbell considered women as "citizens." For example, she begins "The Woman and Democracy," chapter six of Business of Woman, with this statement: "The one notion that democracy has succeeded in planting firmly in the mind of the average American citizen is his right and duty to rise in the world. Tested by this conception the American woman is an ideal democrat" (142). Here and elsewhere in her writings, Tarbell applies a test of citizenship to woman, but refrains from calling her "citizen." (In his case she chooses "democrat" instead.) Despite this ambiguous diction, Tarbell designates women as constituents of the US public, and she proposes a political role for women with consequences that transcend even the nation's boundaries. I contend her writings advance a standard of women's citizenship, albeit a deferential model which does not extend to

women the direct authority of voting or serving as an elected official in government.[31]

In her two muckraking histories, Tarbell addresses women's public roles only obliquely. For insight into her vision of woman's citizenship, I turn to a work in which she expounds a theory of women's public participation, derived from her historical and contemporary research on issues of women's rights, democracy, and business. The essays collected in The Business of Being a Woman began appearing in the American after the tariff series ended, running throughout 1912, and were published in a book the same year. Prior to the tariff history, Tarbell wrote The American Woman, published in the American from November 1909 to May 1910, recounting instances of women's participation in US political life from the Revolution through the nineteenth century. The American Woman continues Tarbell's research into women's social roles, which began with her biographies of women of the French revolution.

The Business of Being a Woman represents a culmination of these studies, enhanced with insights from her other writings, which took her throughout the United States and Europe for research. As she puts it, the book is "the result of a long, if somewhat desultory, observation of the professional, political, and

---

[31] In addition to the research of Linda K. Kerber and Michael Schudson (Good Citizen) cited below, Susan Zaeske's "Signatures of Citizenship: The Rhetoric of Women's Antislavery Petitions" is a more recent work that lends support to such an idea of citizenship. Zaeske argues that by signing antislavery petitions, women not only contributed to the abolitionist movement but also re-negotiated the terms of their own citizenship. Lending their signatures to the antislavery movement, they "bypassed the requirement of suffrage to participate publicly in the political debate" over the issue (148).

domestic activities of women in this country and in France" (Business of Woman vii). The book presents her considered opinion on American women's social and political situation, advocating an extension of women's traditional roles as mothers and homemakers. In its invocation of women as citizens and potential publics, it serves, like Tarbell's muckraking, as epideictic rhetoric with interventionist aims, albeit socially conservative ones. Considering it alongside Tarbell's muckraking further illuminates the citizens and publics she invoked in her writings.

In describing woman's business, Tarbell conveys a vision of separate but inseparable--or interdependent--spheres for men and women. She extends the late eighteenth-century American model of the Republican Mother, as summarized by Linda K. Kerber, to posit a role for women that reached from the home to the nation in terms of influence and scope, while being limited to issues and actions associated with motherhood and homemaking. Evidence presented from her writings suggests that Tarbell did not see her life as contradicting her ideal for women citizens. In view of this consistency between her self-image and her prescription, the moral purposes of her muckraking works stand out as equally important as, if not more than, their reformist purposes. Rather than the religious crusader that one commentator suggests she was, though (Evensen), Tarbell could be more accurately described as a mother writ large, a woman who saw her primary task as that of educating citizens of a democracy.

In the tariff and Standard Oil works, Tarbell wrote about domains of action she envisioned as masculine, but which produced consequences that

reached the private sphere of feminine action. Hints of her vision of separate but interdependent spheres for men and women appear in these works. One example occurs in the third chapter of the Standard Oil history, "The Oil War of 1872," described above. As the Producers' Union gathered rhetorical force, amassing its evidence and advancing arguments in local newspapers and public meetings, Tarbell reports that the "oil men" were "encouraged" by "public opinion" and "repeated proofs of aid from all sides" (I: 88). She adds:

> [E]ven the women of the region were asking what they could do, and were offering to wear their 'black velvet bonnets' all summer if necessary. Solid support came from the independent refiners and shippers in other parts of the country who were offering to stand in with [the independents of western Pennsylvania] in their contest. (I: 88)

The juxtaposition of the women's nonverbal, symbolic action with the men's "solid support" reveals that the public action of the independent "oil men" was indeed gendered male. The "oil war" was for the men to wage; they would engage in public arguments, conduct blockades, negotiate, press their case in court. Women would have only a supporting role, an arrangement which Tarbell did not criticize. In fact she approved this division of effort, as she indicates in her writings on women--not, however, because argument and other forms of public action were unladylike, but because in her view the oil business was men's business. Writing about it, judging it, for the purposes of contributing to public morality and educating citizens, was women's business. She makes this division clear in The Business of Being a Woman.

In addressing issues related to what she calls "woman's business," Tarbell elucidates her concept of separate but interrelated spheres of action for women

and men. Tarbell uses "business" in this book to refer to all types of life-supporting action, in which life is understood as requiring material and spiritual sustenance, and action may be wage-earning or not, individual or collective. Business, for Tarbell, thus denotes a realm of human activity, like praxis in ancient Greek usage. Women's praxis and men's praxis are divided roughly along lines of the ancient oikos and polis, respectively, in Tarbell's treatment, but these domains are complicated by the context of modern democracy, in which public participation is not reserved for the leisured class. Neither are the private and public spheres of women and men strictly separated in the modern democracy that Tarbell addresses (if indeed they ever were).[32] Tarbell conjures a social sphere like that described by Hannah Arendt, in which public and private concerns intermix (38-78). Arendt criticizes this modern situation as one in which "society has conquered the public realm" (41). Tarbell's concern is not the same as Arendt's. Tarbell embraces the intersections of private and public concerns within the social sphere, celebrating the very public aspects of women's private-sphere business. In a way she anticipates the liberal feminist mantra of

[32] Feminist inquiries into ancient Greek democracy call into question the commonly assumed exclusion of women from activities in the polis. See for example, Ellen D. Reeder, ed., Pandora: Women in Classical Greece; Andrea A. Lunsford, ed., Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition; Susan C. Jarratt, Rereading the Sohpists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured; and Cheryl Glenn, Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance.

the 1960s and 70s, "The personal is political," though with the aim of preserving rather than subverting the separate-spheres social system.[33]

Tarbell assigns to men the "business of producer and protector" (241); to women, "the making of . . . a home--which means a mate, children, friends, with all the radiating obligations, joys, burdens, these relations imply" (5). The word "radiating" is evocative of the sense conveyed throughout the book that woman's sociopolitical power expands outward from the home. Woman's responsibility as homemaker derives from her natural function as a mother--"Nature's reason for [woman]--is the child" (54), and the "child demands" a home (167). Woman's place in society and politics then emanates from the imperatives of child-rearing and homemaking. The "most vital part in the Woman's Business [is] that of education," Tarbell writes (70); woman's "great task is to prepare the citizen" (81). This function extends to the broadly conceived "socialization" for democratic life. Tarbell explains in chapter four, entitled "The Socialization of the Home," that the home has a distinct "relation to the public" (88). As the place of citizens' socialization, "homes are the logic of democracy," Tarbell asserts (88); all the social processes entailed in democratic life are cultivated (to good or ill effect) within the home. Additionally woman as homemaker assumes

---

[33] As mentioned earlier, Tarbell was primarily a gradualist, not a revolutionary. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell argues that the seemingly "moderate, reformist demands" of the latter twentieth-century feminists' "personal is political" campaign and the consciousness-raising associated with it, were "revolutionary and radical in the extreme," if judged by the consequences they implied for social institutions of marriage and child-rearing ("Women's Liberation" 77). Tarbell's claims serve a quite different end; by arguing for the public power of the homemaking role, she wishes to keep women in the role, not urge them away from it.

significant functions as the nation's chief consumer of household goods (138-40), as well as employer and employee in a "field" of domestic labor replete with its own "labor problem[s]" (158-63). Tarbell thus argues that homemaking entails responsibilities with far-reaching socioeconomic impacts.

In the last chapter, "On the Ennobling of the Woman's Business," Tarbell summarizes her vision of women's and men's private and public spheres:

> Human society may be likened to two great circles, one revolving within the other. In the inner circle rules the woman. Here she breeds and trains the material for the outer circle, which exists only by and for her. That accident may throw her into this outer circle is of course true, but it is not her natural habitat, nor is she fitted by nature to live and circulate freely there. We underestimate, too, the kind of experience which is essential for intelligent citizenship in this outer circle. To know what is wise and needed there one should circulate in it. The man at his labor in the street, in the meeting places of men, learns unconsciously, as a rule, the code, the meaning, the need of public affairs as woman learns those of private affairs. What it all amounts to is that the labor of the world is naturally divided between the two different beings that people the world. It is unfair to the woman that she be asked to do the work of the outer circle. The man can do that satisfactorily if she does her part; that is, if she prepares him the material. Certainly, he can never come into the inner circle and do her work. (211-12)

The statement that men's "outer circle . . . exists by and for [woman]" may seem to imply woman is the center of the universe, that she somehow represents the end of all men's undertakings. However, that men's business would be entirely "for" women contradicts Tarbell's repeated arguments against the notion that one sex is superior to the other. A clue to her intended meaning in this statement may lie in her explanation of the home's central place in society, to which I have already alluded.

To elaborate, in "The Socialization of the Home," she gives an organic description of "society as a living structure made up of various interdependent institutions, the first and foremost of which is a family or home" (107). The end of individual "industry"--as she has observed in her travels, she says--is the home. Men build homes; women "put meaning into them" (84). The purpose of the home is not merely to provide physical shelter but "to furnish a body for a soul" (85). Although Tarbell does not extend this metaphor to the body politic, such a reading is not inconsistent with her view of the home as the socializing center for the nation's citizens. In her liberal view of democracy, in which individual fulfillment is the end of social institutions, including democracy itself, the home is both focal point and radiating center of all human activity. In this sense, men's business is directed toward the home, the primary place of individual socialization and coincidentally woman's domain.

Tarbell's ideas were old-fashioned in her day, though they were widely shared among a considerable group of women, as reflected in formidable opposition to the activism that led to woman's suffrage in 1918 (Camhi 2, Tomkins 102). As Mary E. Tomkins states, Tarbell "needed the assurance of the continuity of evolutionary change; but, in the case of feminism, her gradualism turned reactionary" (105). Her conservatism in The Business of Being a Woman is consistent with that of her earlier biographies of women in French history, and with that of The Chautauquan, where she began her career (Camhi, Stinson, Tomkins). As Tomkins ably demonstrates, the biography of Madame Roland in particular reveals its author's preference for evolutionary rather than

revolutionary change (31-37; 104). Tomkins finds that Tarbell's later writings on American women reveal again the author's "impulse to create the new order by extending rather than eliminating the old one" (100). This description especially suits The Business of Being a Woman, in which Tarbell presents a theory of women's social and political functions, for her theory represents an extension of the Republican Mother ideal, espoused by US writers at the turn of the nineteenth century.

Kerber presents the Republican Mother model of citizenship as an original American contribution to liberal theory, an effort to fill a "gap" in Enlightenment political thought of men such as Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu, and Condorcet. American theorists Judith Sargent Murray, Benjamin Rush, and Susannah Rowson, writing in the 1780s and 90s, did not go so far as to argue for women's suffrage as others shortly would; rather, they described a political function that accrued from woman's traditional position within the home (Kerber 58).[34] Dissatisfied that women should be encouraged to a "dependence" contrary to American ideals, they proposed a woman citizen who

> was to be self-reliant (within limits), literate, untempted by the frivolities of fashion. She had a responsibility to the political scene, though not to act on it. . . . Her political task was accomplished within the confines of her family. The model republican woman was a mother. (Kerber 58)

---

[34] Kerber cites Judith Sargent Murray, The Gleaner (Boston: I. Thomas, 1798), Benjamin Rush, "Thoughts upon Female Education, Accommodated to the Present State of Society, Manners and Government in the United States of America" (Philadelphia: Prichard and Hall, 1787), reprinted in Frederick Rudolph, ed., Essays on Education in the Early Republic (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), and Susannah Rowson, Reuben and Rachel (Boston: Hanning and Loring, 1798).

The Republican Mother was a "deferential citizen," one "who expect[ed] to influence the political system, but only to a limited extent" (Kerber 59). She "did not vote, but took pride in [her] ability to mold citizens who would" (Kerber 60). Significantly, deference was not a uniquely feminine political posture. As Kerber explains, it was "an approach to full participation in the civic culture" that recognized representative authority. Michael Schudson characterizes 1690 to 1787 as a period of deference in which unpropertied, white, male citizens looked to "men of high social standing" for political leadership (Good Citizen 30). In this period of American history, the deferential citizenship described by Schudson did not depend upon suffrage, which was often exclusive to property-holders. Kerber remarks that women's politicization was "out of phase" with men's; women adopted deference as men were turning toward more egalitarian ideas of political participation (60). Nevertheless, the deferential citizenship of Republican Motherhood is not synonymous with True Womanhood, an ideal so named by its adherents writing in women's magazines mid-nineteenth century (Welter).

True Womanhood was "somewhat similar" to Republican Motherhood, in that its proponents saw woman's social role as centered in the home, as P. Joy Rouse comments (114). However, True Womanhood was a cultural ideal with potential political ramifications, whereas Republican Motherhood was an explicitly political ideal. The True Woman was a model of "piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity" (Welter 21); the focus of this ideal is on virtuous characteristics identified with femininity. From the passages quoted by

Welter as illustrations of the ideal, these characteristics appear to have served as much to keep women from interfering in men's work as to further any particular social goals of women's own. In contrast, Republican Motherhood, as presented by Kerber, focused on women's political role, seeking to encourage women to serve as a constructive force in furthering the new nation's material and spiritual prosperity.

Tarbell imbued her model of womanhood with political significance; her woman citizen has little in common with True Womanhood and much in common with Republican Motherhood. Expanding on and imparting economic significance to each key characteristic noted by Kerber--self-reliance, literacy, disregard for frivolous fashion, and fulfillment of a political function centered on citizens' education--she creates a model that accommodates industrialism by extending the Republican Mother's scope of influence.

Tarbell's ideal is an exemplar of the "sturdy self-reliance" she mentions in her counter-example to the tariff-made man, cited earlier. Pride in one's work is a component of the democratic "spirit," according to Tarbell. Self-reliance, or "paying one's way," is a democratic imperative, and she chastises those who "poach" or "sponge" (Business of Woman 144-45). Throughout the work, Tarbell argues against the woman as economically dependent, in notion and in practice. She laments that women are inadequately trained to assume the full weight of their responsibility as household managers, resulting in their de facto position as "parasites," a position they in turn learn to accept in principle (60-61). Although men are the providers for a family, Tarbell argues that proposals of

"'Paid Motherhood'" or "weekly wages" for women overlook the fact, as she sees it, that women already occupy "an equal economic place with [men] in . . . marriage" (63). Man earns, woman spends; both are equally important in maintaining solvency in household economics. If a woman "does not know a debit from a credit . . . she becomes an economic dependent," because she is incapable of performing one of her crucial duties as a wife and homemaker (63). One part of Tarbell's solution to this problem is the type of epideictic rhetoric in praise of homemaking that she offers in her book; women, she says, need to appreciate fully the importance of their work as homemakers. Another is training, which falls primarily to mothers to provide, but which Tarbell also envisions as appropriate for schools and colleges to offer (62-64; 69-70; 107-8; 173-74).

Tarbell explicitly sought to professionalize homemaking (221), and she argues that like other professionals, the homemaker requires adequate education. There is a science to the work, as presented in the book, but there is also an art to it; Tarbell depicts homemaking as essentially a technē that defies a formulaic or rule-bound approach (see especially 60-61). The end of the art of homemaking is nothing short of creating an atmosphere in which family members, guests, and workers may thrive and find happiness (84-108); Tarbell likens homemaking to business management, but in her description it is also politics writ small. Given the complexity of her task, Tarbell's woman citizen must be broadly educated, along the lines of classical political orators, both by schooling and experience.

Woman gained access to higher education in the newly formed United States, Tarbell claims, because "it fits her intellectually to be a companion worthy

of a child" (74). "Every home is perforce a good or bad educational center," she asserts (70). The woman who heads it "has need of all the education the college can give, all the experience and culture she can gather. She knows that the fuller her individual life, the broader her interests, the better for the child. She should be a person in his [or her] eyes" (74). Like the Republican Mother, Tarbell's model woman must be capable of raising fit citizens (81). In writing of this responsibility, Tarbell seems to assume a male citizen, when she mentions preparation for "practical politics," a man's field:

> Her great task is to prepare the citizen. The citizen is not prepared by a training in practical politics. Something more fundamental is required. The meaning of honor and of the sanctity of one's word, the understanding of the principles of democracy and of the society in which we live, the love of humanity. . . . (81).

She elaborates on the traditional citizen-preparation role, though, to address the need for women to attend to training their own successors in the art of "scientific household management" (70).

Tarbell covers the topic of fashion, mentioned by Kerber, in chapter five, "A Woman and Her Raiment," positing "clothes" as one of three "leading occupations of [woman's] life" (108). (The other two are "her domestics" and "her daughter," covered in chapters six and seven, respectively.)[35] Clothes are a "leading occupation" of many women for the wrong reasons in Tarbell's opinion, namely anti-democratic class-consciousness and excessive materialism. But she

[35] This is a curious trio, considering the statement quoted above that woman's "great task is to prepare the citizen," a citizen who sounds male. Tarbell's omission of "sons" from her list of women's "leading occupations" may be attributed to her purpose of explaining the aspects of woman's business she finds not only significant but also most frequently overlooked.

posits sound reasons as well for the economically and socially conscious woman to be concerned with clothes. Tarbell praises the popular "street suit" as a triumph of feminists, "a genuine democratization of [women's] clothes" that exemplifies "one of the great principles of sensible clothing," that of "fitness" for the occasion (134-35). The two other principles are "beauty," which "depends upon line and color," and "ethics," which "depends upon quality and the relation of cost to one's means" (135). These principles of dress constitute a lesson in "the importance of the common and universal things of life," according to Tarbell (137; emphasis in original), and thus she finds them important in acculturating youth. With this idea she subscribes to a cultural elitism similar to that found in contemporaneous humanist rhetorical traditions discussed in chapter three. She imbues a culture-bound ideal with foundational meaning, imparting universality to what is in fact a contextual norm.

She places more emphasis, though, on the socioeconomic ramifications of clothing selection. "The matter of dress is the more important," she states, "because bound up with it is a whole grist of social and economic problems," such as those of "cost of living, of woman's wages, of wasteful industries, of the social evil itself" (139). She does not specify "the social evil," but she may be referring to the materialism and class-consciousness mentioned earlier in the chapter, where she criticizes women's tendency to "array" rather than "clothe themselves," with the encouragement of men who wish to display their wealth via wives' and daughters' dress. Tarbell rebukes this impulse as "an anomaly in a democracy," an "adoption of discarded aristocratic devices for proving you are

better than your neighbor" (110-12). Moreover "dress," she says, is woman's "most direct weapon against industrial abuses, her all-powerful weapon as a consumer" (139). The responsibility of informed consumership, "[l]ike all of the great interests in the Business of Being a Woman, . . . is primarily an individual" matter, Tarbell claims. "[E]very woman who solves it for herself, that is, arrives at what may be called a sound mode of dress, makes a real contribution to society" (140). Her prescription may sound naïve to today's readers, but to Progressive era audiences surrounded by reform efforts, it would likely have seemed plausible. Although she invokes citizens with this idea, she invokes a potential public of the sort in which members are not necessarily aware of each other, as they participate in their individual actions toward a common goal; Hauser finds evidence of such a public in letters written to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (Vernacular Voices ch. 8).

Tarbell again emphasizes the public potential of accrued action on the part of individual citizens in chapter six, "The Woman and Democracy." Arguing that woman has a responsibility to "democratize her own special field of labor," pertaining to the household (162), Tarbell summons both citizens and publics among her audience of women readers. Women who employ servants should help end the exploitation of foreign and immigrant workers, Tarbell suggests, by training domestic staff and preparing them to become "independent"--by which she means they should become wives and makers of their own homes (157). In addition Tarbell sees the low status of work in the home as contributing to the devaluation of women's labor in general (158-61). Invoking citizens, she asserts

that every woman, with or without household servants, "has a direct individual part" in the task of "democratizing" woman's labor, "just as every man has a direct part in the democratization of public life" (162). She also, secondarily, invokes potential publics:

> Individual effort aside, though it is the most fundamental, [woman] has various special channels of power through which she can work--her clubs, for instance. If the vast machinery of the Federation of Woman's Clubs could be turned to this problem of the democratization of domestic service, what an awakening might we not hope for! (162)

"Yet it is doubtful," she adds, immediately checking her enthusiasm, "if it will be through the trained woman's organizations that the needed revolution will come. It will come, as always, from the ranks of the workers" (162).[36] While she expresses a preference for individual action throughout the book, on this issue Tarbell sees women as having neglected their own realm of "labor problems" while striving, however admirably, "to better the conditions in trades which men control" (148). She seeks to direct the same force toward household labor, by persuading the women who control it to be citizens who are more politically conscious managers.

Despite Tarbell's reactionary agenda in relation to the feminism of her time, her invocation of women citizens significantly extends the turn-of-the-century vision of Republican Motherhood. Tarbell's arguments in effect assign to women intellectual, moral, and economic, though not legal, authority--and power--over vast areas of politics. Her description of women's business includes

---

[36] This is a rare instance in which Tarbell uses the word "revolution" in a way that suggests she advocates it.

education of children and youth, social relations and ethical matters broadly construed, some aspects of housing, economic issues touching upon the household, and women's labor issues in and out of the home. She does not confine women to the home or even the immediate community, but approves of their engagement in these areas of expertise on national and international levels.[37] Nor does she restrict women to passive roles or symbolic public action such as the wearing of black bonnets proposed by the women of the oil regions in the fight against Standard Oil. Within the realm of expertise she envisions for women, Tarbell applauds and encourages their collective action, even though, in keeping with her liberal emphasis on the individual, she sees individual action as the primary means of effecting change.

Tarbell's "Progressive Conservative" Politics

Tarbell's woman citizen, the image of Republican Mother revised to serve an industrialized free-market vision of democracy, has a wide range of avenues open to her by which she may participate in democratic processes. She remains a deferential citizen, though, restricted from exercising the direct political authority of voting and elective office-holding. This conservative ideal is not as

---

[37] Woman's part in social and ethical arenas extended as far as world peace efforts, as Tarbell indicates in "War! What the Women of America Can Do to Prevent It," Woman's Day, April 1939, 47 (qtd. in Tomkins 120-21). Referring to "Peace" with feminine pronouns, Tarbell says that peace efforts require a "machinery as scientific" as that devoted to war. "The machinery of Peace is diplomacy," in which Tarbell sees women as potential contributors through such organizations as "Peace Societies." Her own contributions were rhetorical; Tarbell reported on the 1919 Paris Peace Conference for Red Cross Magazine and afterward gave public lectures on world peace negotiations (Tarbell, Day's Work 352).

incongruous with Tarbell's position as a Progressive muckraker as it may seem. In fact, Progressivism and the muckraking journalism that served it proved congenial to Tarbell's gradualist vision of reform and to the deferential citizenship she prescribed for women, including herself.

Tarbell's efforts to effect legal reforms aimed at democratizing business seem at odds, at first glance, with her efforts to prevent legal reforms aimed at further democratization of the vote. As Tomkins explains, though, regulation of business by "government" and "by the apron strings of women were both important parts of her vision" (106). Furthermore, in Tarbell's view, granting women direct roles in elective politics would diffuse the power that derived from abilities she saw as innate to women; it would erode the social order that depended upon strong, capable leadership in the areas she saw as calling for women's special abilities. Women's struggle for democratic equality was moot, she argues in The Business of Being a Woman, because women were already equal to men. Her arguments are not satisfactory in today's political context, but the problem as she presented it was that women did not recognize the equality and the power they possessed. In an age-old "grass is greener" type of longing, she explains, they struggled to "imitate men," and in doing so, they propagated the view that woman occupied a social position inferior to that of man. In today's system of near-universal suffrage for citizens, the idea that Tarbell stood for "democracy" while opposing women's right to vote is absurd; but Tarbell's claims appear quite consistent from her perspective. Tomkins adds that, though defeated with the 19th Amendment, Tarbell's arguments served a "valuable"

function as public discourse: She "presented options for consideration by members of her society, who validate or invalidate visions" (Tomkins 106).

While Tarbell differed with other women Progressives on the issue of suffrage, her "progressive conservative" opinions on business reflect an optimistic faith in fair competition characteristic of Progressive reform efforts (Tomkins 143). As Louis Filler observes, the Progressive movement "reaffirm[ed] the nation's willingness to take its chances on competition in business, so long as it could be reassured that no one and no business could become so powerful as to render the ordinary citizen, the 'little man,' powerless" (280). This sentiment appears in Tarbell's writings as the topos of democratic fairness considered within the context of business dealings. In a study of turn-of-the-century American socialist and Progressive journalism, Shiela Reaves notes that the muckrakers appeared radical, but only for a short time. From 1902 to 1906 socialist writers saw Progressive muckrakers as sympathetic to socialism, but after 1906, the socialist press criticized the muckrakers as having joined the capitalists and become part of a "magazine trust" (769). Tarbell describes her efforts on the American Magazine to reveal to the "public" the "steady, though slow, progress" she and her colleagues found occurring in industrial reforms (Day's Work 260). The American, she writes, "had little genuine muckraking spirit. It did have a large and fighting interest in fair play" (281). This optimistic belief in the democratic possibilities of free-market capitalism distinguished Progressives from their more radical socialist contemporaries. As Miraldi puts it, "the muckrakers were, after all, a rather conservative bunch" (Muckraking 8).

Tarbell's position as a prominent journalist and public speaker is also surprisingly consistent with her views on women's praxis. Her model of the deferential woman citizen contains no strictures against public speaking, writing, or action, within the considerably wide realm of woman's expertise as homemaker and mother. The topics of her two major muckraking pieces, monopoly and tariffs, are related only tangentially to woman's business as homemaker, and in this respect Tarbell's writing on them seems to defy the role she prescribed. However, viewed as citizens'-education projects, they fall within woman's sphere as she presented it. Rather than consider Tarbell consciously or unconsciously two-faced, it is fairer to this thoughtful "student of the times," as she accurately described herself, to consider her muckraking as primarily an epideictic rhetoric of citizenship, aimed at effecting reforms that would enhance citizens' democratic opportunities to pursue their livelihood. In this light, the discomfort Tarbell expresses in her autobiography with the title of "muckraker" appears more genuine, less an attempt at false modesty.

Her theory of women's citizenship also helps explain her response to an incident in which a fellow speaker treated her with disrespect on a speaking tour. This incident illustrates both the richness and the limitations of women's praxis as she envisioned and enacted it. In 1919, after covering the Paris Peace Conference for Red Cross Magazine, she set out on a Chautauqua circuit to share her insights on world peace, a topic which, dealing with common humane issues, albeit on a large scale, she assumed were appropriate to women (see note 37). An ardent supporter of Woodrow Wilson's controversial proposal for a League of Nations,

she spoke in favor of the measure. As she relates, "My business now as a journalist and a lecturer, I told myself, was to explain the intent of the Covenant, what it set out to do, also to warn that it must be given time to work out its salvation" (352). She put forth her arguments from the lecture platform, until mid-circuit, William Jennings Bryan convinced her to speak on a different topic (which she does not identify) for the two weeks during which they shared the evening lecture period. Tarbell describes Bryan, one-time presidential candidate and former Secretary of State, as a speaker who "for many years had been the brightest star of the Chautauqua platform" (355). The Chautauqua managers put him on at his convenience, and asked other speakers to accommodate his schedule. Tarbell was instructed to make such accommodations, and she says, "I, of course, obeyed" (355).

Trouble occurred when Bryan discovered that her speech, delivered before his, directly opposed the position he presented on the League of Nations topic. He told Tarbell she "must not" express views contrary to his. "He in no way tried to influence my opinion," she says, "only to shut it off" (356). When she suggested that the audience would benefit from hearing different viewpoints, Bryan said, "'The audience came to hear me; it is important they know my views'" (356). Tarbell's account, written almost two decades later, conveys an undeniable sense of injustice in the situation, as well as her disarming resignation. She writes:

> Of course Mr. Bryan did not say, "You are of no political importance, and I am of a great deal," but that was what he meant. It was quite true, and I bowed for the time being to the demands of politics, but only for the moment. The two weeks over, I began again to talk guarantees with more

> interest on the part of my audience because of what Mr. Bryan had been saying and also, I suspect, less agreement. (356)

Her assent to the idea that she was of "no political importance" relative to Bryan--her comment that "[i]t was quite true--is so preposterous to us today that it immediately sounds disingenuous. Her ability to capture the injustice suggests that she indeed may have chafed at Bryan's insinuation. But, understanding her ideas of woman's political function, her agreement sounds more like an attempt at a reasoned response to a situation at which she chafed. She had her place and time, as a woman, to advance her arguments, and she did so. Such is the lot of the deferential citizen, and she acquiesced to it.

Tarbell's deferential model of women's citizenship converged as well with developing norms of objectivity in journalism. Miraldi shows that later "muckrakers," investigative reporters of the 1960s and 70s, were prevented by the conventions of objectivity from arguing overtly for specific changes. In effect, objectivity demanded that reporters defer to the authority of those whom they quoted as sources. Writing her autobiography long after the era of her own muckraking--and after the post-World War I changes in journalism that established objectivity norms--Tarbell reveals her sympathy with the new standards. She explains that she and her <u>American</u> colleagues "sought to present things as they were, not as somebody thought they ought to be. We were journalists, not propagandists" (281). Clearly Tarbell played loose with this ideal. She wrote, after all, of "woman's business" as she thought it ought to be. Yet the signs of what Miraldi identifies as "fledgling objectivity" permeate her work, including the opinionated <u>Business of Woman</u>. She waited to write the book until

she felt she had amassed adequate evidence of what she sensed was going awry in women's struggle for equality. She presents the work as the "result" of her empirical study of women--"a long . . . observation of the professional, political, and domestic activities of women . . ." (Business of Woman vii).

Part of what made the American of 1912 seem so mild in comparison to the McClure's of 1902 to 1906 (Reaves, Semonche), then, was perhaps its forthright attempt to achieve balance in its reporting--to tell the good news as well as the bad, as Tarbell explains (Day's Work 280). Among the usual culprits named in the demise of muckraking, such as advertising, buyouts, and libel threats--in short, effects of commercialism--Miraldi points to "a restraint from within," that of "professionalism" (62-71). To guard against criticism of unprofessionalism, reporters sought "consensually validated methods of presenting evidence" and increasingly came to demand of themselves that the "facts" be allowed to "speak for themselves" (Miraldi, Muckraking 72). The "fledgling objectivity" emerging in muckrakers' reporting effectively segued into a professional standard that required them to defer to the authority of their sources' information and opinions, rather than to assert their own.

A final insight on the conservative-progressivism of Tarbell's epideictic rhetorics of citizenship is that while they represented the practice of rhetoric as technē, an art of intervention and invention, in some respects they echoed conservative, elitist ideals of higher education. The point of this observation is that rhetoric as technē may be used for socially disruptive or preservationist ends alike; technē is not an inherently radical tool. Even with muckraking, Tarbell's

most reform-oriented journalism, she presented lessons in citizenship, drawn from humanistic and scientistic professional ideals circulating at the time; her writings echo the lessons of liberal culture and utility proponents in higher education, discussed in chapters two and three. Tomkins notes that Tarbell carried throughout her career the "Chautauqua vision" inherited from her youth. She envisioned "an industrialized America that retained, while renewing, the institutions of the pre-Civil War era into which she had been born" (Tomkins 156). Like nineteenth-century humanists in rhetoric, Tarbell assumed that a liberal education, whether of the Chautauqua or college curriculum, was of universal value. So, as Tomkins adds, "[n]ever did she advocate the imposition of these [pre-Civil-War] institutions or the values which helped create them, for it never seriously occurred to her to question that they were the culmination of Western civilization" (156). At the same time, Tarbell advanced scientistic, professional ideals of business leadership, in works that followed those discussed here, as well as a scientistic theory of professional citizenship, in her writing on woman's business. Tarbell exercised the technē of rhetoric, a democratic dynamis, as she felt appropriate within the bounds of deferential citizenship; in doing so she effectively transmitted key messages of higher education and embodied in rhetorical curricula, to wider extra-academic audiences.

CONCLUSION

Tarbell's rhetoric simultaneously demonstrates the intervention of technē and the public-forming potential of epideictic, as it encourages liberal democratic principles as the basis of citizen action. While she did not advocate radical

reform--never embracing socialism as Lincoln Steffens did, for example, and consistently shunning revolution--she clearly wanted to change what had become the status quo. In her writing on women, she sought more to stem the tide of approaching change in woman's role. Here, too, she wished to intervene in public affairs and to invent--or reinvent--possibilities that seemed to be escaping women in what Tarbell saw as a misbegotten struggle for equality.

As she wrote her life story, Tarbell was obviously interested in capturing her "platform." She used the word as if she were a candidate running for election, outlining the beliefs she stood for, the principles of public conduct she would work to uphold. In assuming the role of rhetor, she participated actively in public life, though within the limits she outlined in her model of the woman citizen. Ironically this deferential citizenship effectively describes the role journalists of Tarbell's era were carving out for themselves in public life, as objective commentators who claimed no direct public authority to act in affairs on which they advised citizens. Her ideas on women and her ideas on journalism converged to provide a ready-made outlet for her impulses toward research and a type of public service that would nurture her democratic vision of liberal individualism.

Tarbell never wrote a treatise on her ideas about the value or function of the press, but in her work she provides ample information on the role she assumed for herself, providing insights into rhetorical and journalistic practice as well as public issues of her day and ours. Tarbell's writings exemplify the public-building potential of journalism envisioned and practiced as rhetoric. This

potential, introduced conceptually in chapter one, is reviewed and considered briefly in the context of current practices in the next (and final) chapter.

Chapter 5: Interdisciplinary Research and Teaching in Rhetoric and Journalism: How and Why

INTRODUCTION

At the outset of this dissertation I proposed that professors of rhetoric and journalism who aspire to promote public participation should collaborate toward their common ends. I suggested that as teachers and scholars of interdependent arts of public discourse, rhetoricians and journalists share concerns that are more closely related than current disciplinary configurations imply. The proposal that academics in these disciplines work together more often in their research and teaching rests on several assumptions, which I have supported throughout the dissertation with theoretical, historical, and critical arguments.

The first assumption is that journalists and rhetoricians can agree on what democracy looks like in action, that their visions of public participation are compatible. This assumption in turn presumes that the reasons for the initial separation of journalism and rhetoric in the academy do not present insurmountable challenges to interdisciplinary collaboration today. A third assumption is that journalists, rhetoricians, and their students could benefit from interdisciplinary efforts of some sort. The first section of this chapter reviews support provided for each of these assumptions in the preceding chapters, focusing primarily on the potential for integrated research and theory. The second section continues support for the third assumption, focusing on the gains that may accrue from interdisciplinary efforts in undergraduate teaching.

INTEGRATING RHETORIC AND JOURNALISM RESEARCH: A RATIONALE

Compatible Ideas of Public Participation and a Heuristic Theory

Among rhetoricians and journalists who express an interest in how their work may affect democracy, those who explicitly address public participation are of most concern to this project. Public participation is crucial to democracy, as it is considered the authorizing force of government by and for the many. Representative and direct democracies alike depend upon continuous attention to public opinion, issued from the widest possible public participation. Reviewing a few prominent examples of research in which scholars of different disciplines use similar topoi to make arguments about democracy, I find that the arguments do present compatible notions of publics and public participation, even though they sometimes assume and serve different models of democracy.

This claim may seem a bit obvious or perhaps circular; i.e., I looked for similar ideas of "publics" among sources discussing topics related to "publics," and lo and behold, I found the similar ideas I was looking for. However, the compatibility and frequent agreement found among the consulted sources are significant because the sources are from distinct academic disciplines, which not only operate largely independently of one another but have done so for about a century, as shown in chapter three. While the authors consulted on current publics theory in chapter one move in somewhat interconnected spheres, some citing each other's work, mutual awareness among all of them is not apparent. Furthermore, common topoi or even common terms do not in themselves signal consensus or even congeniality, as a survey of definitions of key concepts in

almost any discipline would likely illustrate. (Diverse definitions of "rhetoric" present a good example.) Hence, I consulted those works that seemed to offer promise for interdisciplinary efforts in addressing the democratic challenge of promoting public participation.

Journalists, rhetoricians, and communication scholars who address public participation do so from diverse perspectives. Some of the more obvious statements about public participation in journalism come from proponents of "public journalism" (also "civic journalism") such as Davis "Buzz" Merritt and Jay Rosen. The public journalism movement in turn has gained the attention of researchers generally concerned with journalism's public functions and journalists' ethics; among this group are James W. Carey and Theodore L. Glasser. Others, including Robert Miraldi and co-authors James S. Ettema and Theodore L. Glasser, consider the ways in which investigative reporting effects public action. In rhetoric, efforts to address public participation often draw upon ancient theories and practices of public discourse, such as those described by Isocrates and Aristotle, which emphasize the constitutive functions of public discourse and the contingency of public knowledge. Rhetoricians working from these ancient traditions to promote public participation include Janet M. Atwill, Rosa A. Eberly, G. Thomas Goodnight, and Gerard A. Hauser. Providing additional historical insights into rhetorical and journalistic facets of publics are communication scholars Kenneth Cmiel, John Durham Peters, and Michael Schudson.

Many of these scholars assume a Deweyan notion of a "public"--a group of people who recognize that they share interests as a consequence of others' actions, and thus join together to discuss and potentially act further on those interests. These scholars also assume or support recent extensions of this basic idea that posit a public sphere consisting of many and diverse publics in various stages of realization or demise. Hauser refers to this complex discursive network as the "reticulate public sphere" and provides a thorough explanation of and rationale for this network of publics as the central feature of democracy (Vernacular Voices). The reticulate public sphere, and the Aristotelian concept of rhetoric Hauser and others find useful in describing discourse that constitutes publics, serve as a basis for the heuristic theory I offer for envisioning the interaction of journalists' and other citizens' rhetorics in the formation of publics and public opinion.

In this discursive, dynamic model of the public sphere, rhetoric is the generator of publics. In using the word "generator," I allude to Aristotle's description of rhetoric as a dynamis, a human power, exercised within the social-political realm of the polis. Rhetoric powers public action: People use rhetoric to guide or direct action in their behalf as a public; they use rhetoric to supply the impetus and meaning for action. More broadly, rhetoric is a general art of discourse and reasoning by which people make judgments about issues that concern them as social and political beings. It is so generally useful that it is adaptable to virtually any subject or arena of human endeavor; scholars have argued that rhetoric is the means of inventing philosophy (Johnstone), that there

are rhetorics of biology and other sciences (Myers, Gross). My concern in this dissertation has been with rhetoric as a general art in another sense, though--as an art of public discourse, an art applicable to any subjects discussed in the public sphere, and thus accessible and relevant to a general audience of non-experts on the issues being discussed. This understanding of public discourse draws upon Goodnight's distinction between the widely accessible discourse of the public sphere and the more exclusionary discourses of private and technical spheres. Wide accessibility, and the tolerance of difference entailed in this characteristic, is requisite to the formation of publics, as Hauser maintains (Vernacular Voices 61-64, 79-80).

Atwill's description of the technē tradition of public discourse, expounded by Protagoras and Isocrates and generally preserved by Aristotle, further informs my comparison and integration rhetoric and journalism throughout this project. Rhetoric as technē is the public-generating art I have just described. In Atwill's terms it is an art of intervention and invention, an art that enables people to intervene in human endeavors to invent new possibilities for themselves as a public. Atwill distinguishes the technē tradition from humanist tradition. In the latter, rhetoric contains or is associated with a type or body of knowledge. Humanist rhetoric is conservative, fulfilling a normative socializing function by imparting and preserving cultural knowledge. In contrast, rhetoric understood as technē is a flexible, adaptable art of discourse and reasoning that generates new knowledge.

As I have argued in chapter one, rhetoric understood as technē is the means by which journalists and other citizens collaborate in inventing public opinion. Journalism, particularly the reporting and commentary of news media, presents epideictic rhetoric that can prepare audience members for public participation. Journalism routinely performs this function by making implicit arguments of value that suggest issues worthy of people's attention. These arguments are openly available and widely understandable to general audiences, and they offer topoi from which audience members may construct their own arguments about issues they feel compelled to address. A group of such people addressing an issue by engaging others in rhetoric, comprises a public. These people's judgments on an issue, expressed or read as collective arguments, constitute public opinion, or the opinion of "a" public, on that issue.

Journalists do not necessarily reflect public opinion, although they may do so, by providing forums for audience members' discourse or by reporting discussions from other public forums. Nor do journalists dictate public opinion, although they often provide topoi used in the invention of public opinion. Like other epideictic rhetors, journalists can pursue additional means of encouraging publics to form as well. As I have suggested, journalists are likely to be most effective in promoting publics if they engage in reporting that highlights publics' potential to form. They ought to cultivate a sensitivity to what Eberly calls "inchoate publics" (Citizen Critics, "From Writers"), those in various stages of realization, as evidenced by recurring topoi in various arguments on particular issues. With an awareness of the rhetorical processes through which publics

form, journalists can encourage a similar awareness among their audiences, prompting audience members to see their own potential to participate in public affairs.

Recent works in journalism, also discussed in chapter one, suggest some promising approaches to fostering publics. Public journalists propose reporting that highlights different ways in which audience members may be implicated in the consequences of actions being reported (Merritt). Scholarship on investigative reporting points to ways in which journalists move officials and publics to action, providing insight into the rhetorical functions of this news genre. In Miraldi's analysis, investigative reporters give sustained attention to an issue with arguments that follow roughly the same process of public decision-making presented in rhetorical stases (Muckraking and Objectivity). Ettema and Glasser show that investigative journalism presents implicit arguments of value that help establish and maintain ethical norms (Custodians of Conscience), a function of epideictic rhetoric of "praise or blame."

My rhetorical analysis of Ida M. Tarbell's writings, in chapter four, further illustrates journalism's public-building potential as epideictic rhetoric. Using concepts of Edwin Black's "second persona" and Kenneth Burke's "identification," I theorize the rhetorical dynamic involved in journalists' invocation of citizens and publics, to highlight this public-building potential. Journalism, I argue, like other practices of epideictic rhetoric, can invoke citizens, inviting audience members to take individual action directed toward a common good. Journalism can also invoke publics, inviting audience members to see

themselves as people who could engage in collective action to address common interests. Tarbell's works illustrate this rhetorical potential, as they invoke citizens and publics by holding up publics as models for emulation, by implicating audience members as potential plaintiffs in indictments against corruption of public power, and by appealing to values associated with democratic participation. These topoi, or strategies of argument, which offer potential to promote public participation, may be viable for journalists to use today, particularly as journalists continue to seek rhetorical alternatives like those described by Merritt, Miraldi, and Ettema and Glasser, to twentieth-century norms of "objectivity."

Historic Basis for Separation: A Thing of the Past (Mostly)

My integration of rhetorical and journalistic concepts of public participation in chapter one and the use of rhetorical theory to explain the dynamics of publics-invocation in journalism in chapter four suggest the potential for mutual support among scholars in journalism and rhetoric who seek to promote public participation. In chapters two and three I return to the historical context in which journalism and rhetoric separated in the academy, to locate possible reasons for the separation and to determine whether those reasons might present impediments to interdisciplinary cooperation today. In short, my research suggests they do not. The separation occurred in large part, I contend, because journalism as a public-oriented vocational subject was largely incommensurate with rhetoric's academic and belletristic emphases. Recent rhetorical theory advanced by scholars cited in chapters one and three rejects the late nineteenth-

century traditions of rhetoric--primarily humanist, by Atwill's definition--that proved inhospitable to journalism. This recent scholarship emphasizes rhetoric's centrality to processes of public participation, in keeping with the ancient idea of rhetoric as technē.

If any turn-of-the-century curriculum were to signal a potential lingering incompatibility between rhetoric and journalism, that of Fred Newton Scott's Department of Rhetoric and Journalism at the University of Michigan would be a likely candidate. In remaining separate from English and offering journalism alongside rhetoric for twenty-seven years, Scott's combined department (called "Rhetoric" from 1903 through 1920 and "Rhetoric and Journalism" from 1921 through 1929) was unusual among its counterparts at major universities. Scholars working to "revive" rhetoric in the 1970s and 80s hailed Scott as something of a visionary. Albert R. Kitzhaber, Donald C. Stewart, and James A. Berlin found in Scott's work anticipation of some of the socially conscious theory and pedagogy they favored. In this light, Scott's inability to keep the two subjects together might have predicted similar incompatibility between them today.

However, my examination of his program in chapter two shows that Scott's views were more closely aligned with the belletristic and current-traditional approaches of his era than Kitzhaber's, Berlin's, and Stewart's assessments indicate. Scott led his contemporaries in many respects, but his rhetorical theory and teaching, like that of his colleagues, followed humanist traditions. He argued against the rhetoric of Aristotle and its aim of persuasion in the realm of contingent truths, in favor of the ideal of rhetoric expressed in Plato's

Phaedrus, as an art by which philosophers lead souls to comprehend eternal truth. Tensions between the public orientation of journalism and the academic and literary leanings of rhetoric thus plagued even Scott's rather innovative combination of the two subjects. He may have anticipated rhetorical thought of the 1950s to 70s (Berlin, Kitzhaber, Stewart), but he did not anticipate that of the 1990s (Atwill, Eberly, Crowley, Hauser), which proves more congenial to journalists' public-oriented theory and practice.

Reviewing developments in rhetoric and journalism over the nineteenth century in chapter three, I posit that both fields professionalized by developing expertise based on knowledge associated with science or belles lettres, or a combination thereof. In the "culture of professionalism" that Burton J. Bledstein describes as developing mid-nineteenth century and continuing into the early twentieth, journalism distinguished itself as a career, while the subject of rhetoric diversified into specialized branches. Journalism studies grew out of one of these branches, composition-rhetoric, at the turn of the twentieth century. In the process of professionalization, rhetoric and journalism acquired characteristics that served exclusionary politics as much as, or perhaps more than, democratic politics, as I have argued. These historical similarities between the two academic disciplines suggest further common ground for interdisciplinary study in rhetoric and journalism today.

My analysis highlights as well an important aspect of disciplinary differentiation that occurred in this process of professionalization. As composition-rhetoric aligned itself with academic and literary expertise, its

offshoot of journalism claimed a public-service role that helped establish journalism as a legitimate and distinct field of study in higher education. The fact of journalism's separation from rhetoric on this basis is evidence of the distance of rhetoric, as conceived and taught at the turn of the twentieth century, from public concerns. As I contend in chapter three, the more rhetoricians pursued humanist traditions that prepared students to assume places in existing professional and social orders, the more they prevented their teaching from serving as a democratic force in politics and society.

As rhetoricians imparted the skills and aesthetic sensibilities sanctioned by professional culture, some journalists, inside and outside the university, were teaching and practicing rhetoric as technē, as a tool of social change. Adams recounts the development of journalism and other writing specialties at the University of Wisconsin as part of an educational movement associated with Progressive politics. Meanwhile, Ida M. Tarbell and her colleagues at McClure's participated in an extracurricular Progressive muckraking movement in journalism. For a brief time, around 1902 to 1916, muckrakers flourished, as they devised a rhetoric to instigate reform. As my analysis of Tarbell's writing shows, though, muckraking did not have a corner on social and political intervention. Tarbell's non-muckraking journalism, while often expressing conservative views, nevertheless represents a rhetoric of technē; Tarbell sought to intervene in the growing movement for women's suffrage and to re-invent an older tradition of women's political participation as homemakers. Tarbell's work, which I characterize overall as a rhetoric of citizens' education, illustrates the public-

building possibilities not only of investigative journalism but of less obviously activist journalistic genres as well.

Potential Gains of Increased Interdisciplinary Research

In outlining the compatibility of publics theories advanced in rhetoric and journalism and the current challenges to theoretical differences that led to the disciplines' initial separation, I have already suggested ways in which both disciplines might benefit from closer interaction today in research and teaching. Specifically, I submit that by consulting each others' research, rhetoricians and journalists can see more of the "whole picture" of public opinion formation, as it is depicted now and as it has been viewed in the past. By seeking ways to collaborate more often in teaching, as outlined in the section following this one, rhetoricians and journalists can potentially encourage more effective public discourse practices among graduates of their programs. In preceding chapters I have argued for and modeled some of these potential benefits.

The integrated theory offered in chapter one and extended in chapter four provides an example of how research in both fields can be mutually informing on the discursive dynamics of publics formation. Among the sources consulted in chapter one, I have noted that both rhetoricians and journalists focus on what Peter Dahlgren describes as the "sense-making processes" entailed in public spheres. Even so, journalism scholars more often analyze journalists' practices, while rhetoricians supply more insight into other citizens' rhetorical practices. I also found the journalism and communication scholars deal more often with "institutional configurations" than do the rhetoricians I consulted. Putting

together discrete treatments of various aspects of publics-formation required consulting scholarship in different disciplines. While such interdisciplinary scholarship is quite common between communication and either journalism or rhetoric, it is less so between the latter two fields.

In collections of articles on issues of public participation, contributions from the field of rhetoric are often conspicuously absent. I describe two examples in chapter one, Public Opinion and the Communication of Consent and Engaging the Public, and point to gaps in coverage that result from the omission of rhetoric. A major oversight occurs in the area of citizens' education at college level, a traditional concern of rhetoric. I suspect that communication and journalism scholars overlook work in the composition branch of rhetoric in particular for reasons similar to those that separated journalism from rhetoric in the first decades of the twentieth century: a perceived difference between journalism as a public art and composition as an academic or literary art. Composition-rhetoric may still seem to many observers to have little relevance to public discourse practices, due to the field's long association with English departments and literary concerns, as illuminated by Crowley (Composition in the University). Additionally the field's pedagogical research emphasis may appear to some public-oriented scholars too inwardly focused on academic concerns. Certainly composition- and speech-rhetoric stress proficiency in academic or professional genres as much as or more than they do the processes of public discourse.

However, historical research on rhetoric pedagogy cited in chapter three indicates considerable interest among current rhetoricians in the public

implications of their scholarship and teaching. Some of this research provides significant insights into the history of journalism teaching and practice (Adams, Professional Writing, Progressive Politics, Group of Their Own). My synthesis of rhetoric and journalism history in chapter three illustrates further the kind of insights to be gained in each field by inquiring into past relationships between teaching and extra-academic practice of public discourse. That chapter highlights some tensions that restricted the contributions of both journalism and rhetoric to democratic politics. One such tension is that between academic and public concerns, while another occurs between professional and public concerns. These tensions are of continuing interest to both fields today, and they remain relevant as well as to the relationship between the two academic disciplines. Further interdisciplinary study could help journalists and rhetoricians meet the challenges associated with these tensions.

These are just a few potential benefits of closer interaction between journalism and rhetoric in research implied in earlier chapters. Each relates to the greater understanding that both fields may gain into the dynamics of public participation. As Elihu Katz observes in the introduction to Public Opinion and the Communication of Consent, "public opinion" and "mass communication," historically separate areas of research, are "elements in a single system" and ought to be studied as such (xxi). Rhetoric, understood as the art central to public opinion formation, is part of that system. As I have attempted to argue and illustrate, rhetoric and journalism together offer a more comprehensive view of

the deployment of public opinion in democracy than does the work of either discipline alone.

INTEGRATING RHETORIC AND JOURNALISM THROUGH TEACHING: POTENTIAL GAINS

Further gains might be expected from interdisciplinary collaboration in teaching, both on a conceptual level, by using ideas from one discipline to inform teaching in the other, and on a practical level, by cooperation between journalists and rhetoricians in educational venues. Drawing from areas of practice and teaching described in chapter one, I propose below some possibilities in which public journalists, investigative journalists, and rhetoricians seeking to promote public participation may find mutual benefits in joining forces to engage students and other citizens in public discourse on college campuses.

Rhetoric-Public Journalism Connections

As I have suggested, public journalists could expect more success in their efforts to engage publics if more citizens were predisposed to these types of reforms. Part of public journalists' challenge is citizen education, an aim they share with rhetoricians. News organizations that attempt, as public journalists propose, to engage community members outside the usual official circles in "setting the news agenda" face the implied educational tasks of helping the community learn to appreciate a conversation model of the news media and habituating them to public participation. These aims can be pursued in part on college campuses, where efforts can be maximized by involving rhetoric classes that are already engaged in teaching arts of public participation.

For example, in the communication department at Kentucky Northern University, Lecturer Ronald P. Grapsy teaches a "special topics" course, "American Civic Communication: The Duties of Citizenship." The course is divided into three units, in which students generate their own opinions on citizenship by discussing three broad topoi (as I would call them) encountered in their readings: "individuality and self-determination," "activism," and "social equality." Starting with these topoi, students prepare and deliver short statements on citizenship throughout the course. In addition, they participate as a group in a campus service project, and they hear guest speakers from local service organizations. This course acquaints students with types of civic engagement that public journalism often encourages--contemplation of civic responsibility and participation in collective community-improvement projects. If a public journalist volunteered to be a guest speaker in this course, the journalist could gain a sympathetic hearing and learn something about the citizens she or he is trying to engage. The students could learn of public journalism and its potential to serve them in their public participation efforts now and in the future, once they leave college. With such exposure students might become advocates of more public-service oriented journalism in general. The students' statements on citizenship could also provide good op-ed material for a public-journalism newspaper or broadcast.

Similarly, other educational events featuring students' public discourse could be fruitful opportunities for public journalists or public journalism students to find and report the types of civic engagement they seek to encourage. Public

and civic journalists sometimes arrange town-hall-type public meetings in which citizens can air their views on issues of common concern. Journalists use these forums to discover salient issues upon which to concentrate their reporting, and they sometimes cover the public forums as news events, as a way of featuring citizens as news-makers. On campus, public forums like these, which occur in rhetorical training, provide ready-made sources of issues and news.

Professors organize at least one or two public forums per semester for students of the introductory rhetoric course in the Division of Rhetoric and Composition at The University of Texas at Austin. These events are part of the First-Year Forum, a series of discussions in and out of class (including online) focused on a book-length argument assigned for reading in all sections of the required course. The common reading one year, for instance, was Neil Postman's Amusing Ourselves to Death; another year's classes read Deborah Tannen's Argument Culture. One forum each year occurs in conjunction with a public lecture, usually by the book's author. After the lecture, a panel of student representatives poses classmates' pre-submitted questions to the speaker, interspersed with questions asked on the spot by audience members. In this way, students participate in public discussion with the author on issues of their choosing. Another typical First-Year Forum event featured a panel discussion in which students made public proposals based on topoi that emerged in discussions of the common reading, and students in the audience responded with questions and comments. In events like these, students' public discourse on current issues could serve the purposes public journalists seek by providing sites of public-

opinion formation for journalists to cover as news or to mine for topoi of future reporting.

DebateWatch, organized nationally by Diana B. Carlin, communication professor and graduate dean at the University of Kansas, provides guidelines for groups to watch and discuss televised debates between political candidates. The initiative is not focused exclusively on student groups, but it has been widely publicized among communication and rhetoric professors as a means of teaching public participation. Again, these group discussions of political debates provide forums where reporters or student journalists can find public opinion in the making. As students learn about the candidates, study the debate process itself, and participate in public discourse, journalists' coverage of these forums on campuses could add another dimension to the experience, giving students a chance to engage publics beyond their own classrooms and campuses.

Each of these suggestions has the additional potential to educate journalists in citizens' discourse practices. Public journalists can certainly learn from experiences in which they witness publics in action. Rhetoricians could also teach public journalists more directly about the discourse skills non-journalists are learning to exercise in the public sphere. Aspiring public journalists could take rhetoric courses or consult with rhetoricians to learn how to analyze (and produce) the informal arguments of public discourse--arguments that are not bound by norms of journalistic objectivity, which public journalists seek to reform, but yet adhere to contextually derived ethical standards. To further their goals of finding and fostering publics, public journalists could learn from rhetoricians how to read

public discourse produced by citizen-critics, as illustrated by Eberly, or the public discourse of "vernacular rhetoric" as illustrated by Hauser.

Such overt interaction is not required for public(s)-minded journalists and rhetoricians to benefit from each other's efforts, but mutual awareness could prove advantageous to both groups. In the Division of Rhetoric and Composition at the University of Texas at Austin, Rosa A. Eberly teaches a course in computers and language called "Radio Rhetorics," in which she gives an assignment, "Call to Local Radio Talk Show," described in Citizen Critics (173-74). Students are asked to call in to an issues-based audience-participation radio show, make a brief argument, and turn in an audio-tape of their participation. This assignment is an example of Eberly's use of the rhetoric classroom as a "protopublic space;" the class is a forum in which students learn and practice public discourse, or the art of participating as members of publics (Citizen Critics 161-73; "From Writers, Audiences"). This course also conceptually links journalists' and other citizens' rhetorics within the complex system of public opinion formation, as students read, discuss, and engage in public discourse on the history of broadcast and Internet media as public forums.

Without involving public journalism per se, Eberly's course teaches students to view and experience news media as serving a public-building function, in keeping with the conversation model advocated by public journalists. As Eberly encourages students to see news media as potential forums for public discourse rather than as commercial enterprises selling entertainment (Citizen Critics 173-74), she contributes to reform efforts like those of public journalists.

Mutual awareness could be of benefit to reformers inside and outside the classroom, encouraging them in their efforts and enabling them to seek further means of supporting each other.

Rhetoric-Investigative Journalism Connections

Similar interaction could occur between rhetoricians and investigative journalists, who seek to instigate public action, as Miraldi maintains (Muckraking and Objectivity), or to promote ethical standards of public service, as Ettema and Glasser argue (Custodians of Conscience). Miraldi points out that the investigative reporter is thwarted by objectivity standards, at the point where advocacy becomes necessary. Miraldi proposes that the reporter agitate behind the scenes to move officials and activists to action. Some of those activists might be found in rhetoric classrooms.

For example, Seth Kahn teaches a writing course at Syracuse University called "Writing as Civic Action," in which the class divides into small groups, each selecting an issue to pursue throughout the semester. Groups investigate their issues and inform their classmates on the issues, providing reading lists and leading class discussions. In addition the groups present public arguments on their issues, in letters to the editor, op-eds, or in other public discourse. Investigative reporters should be on watch for students' civic actions, including those generated within rhetoric courses in which students are learning and practicing public discourse, as potential sources of support in furthering reform efforts.

Mutual support among reporters and student activists seems especially feasible when the reporters themselves are students. David Protess's investigative journalism classes at Northwestern University directly contributed to the release of five prisoners revealed by DNA evidence to have been wrongly convicted ("Students Contributed"). The student journalists' efforts were part of the national Innocence Project housed at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law at Yeshiva University in New York. Protess heads a branch called the Medill Innocence Project at Northwestern's Medill School of Journalism. For a legal project like this one, law and journalism students make an effective team. Rhetoric students could contribute to such an effort, too, though, by activating outside the court system. And on non-legal public issues, students in courses like Kahn's could be among the activists who help generate the public opinion that Miraldi finds crucial to effecting change. Rhetoric students routinely discover issues of interest to them by consulting news media, but investigative journalists could also consult students' public rhetoric to find and cite evidence of public concern on particular issues.

CONCLUSION

These examples of the potential for mutual support among rhetoricians, journalists, and their students uphold my contention that the disciplines of rhetoric and journalism could be more effective in promoting democracy if their practitioners cooperated purposefully. Journalism and rhetoric ought to be taught and practiced as interrelated technai of public discourse, rather than as separate, and perchance, parallel pursuits. The disciplines need not combine

administratively. Instead, I have proposed theoretical, historical, and critical topoi--mental places--in addition to the physical spaces of classrooms and other face-to-face forums, where the two disciplines may join to advance their common ends of promoting publics and public opinion.

Rhetoric's emphasis of academic and literary concerns over public ones, which contributed to the separation of rhetoric and journalism on campuses at the turn of the last century, is no longer as prevalent as it once was in college curricula. Many rhetoricians teach their subject with a view toward preparing citizens to participate in democratic politics. Likewise, teachers and practitioners of public journalism and investigative reporting are working to narrow the gap between journalists and their audiences that professionalism ushered in a century ago. Despite the current status of rhetoric and journalism as separate disciplines, professors in both fields share common interests in advancing public participation. They share similar views of what this end entails, and they share elements of history that can inform current practices in both fields. Rhetoricians and journalists are engaged now in largely separate yet similar citizens'-education and research agendas. With relatively small, well-placed cooperative efforts, the two fields could enhance their potential successes in promoting the rhetorical processes that power democracy, the continual invention and reinvention of publics.

Works Cited

ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS

Department of English Language and Literature Papers, Bentley Historical Library, U of Michigan (DELLP).

Fred Newton Scott Papers, Bentley Historical Library, U of Michigan (FNSP).

BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND OTHER SOURCES

Adams, Katherine H. A Group of Their Own: College Writing Courses and American Women Writers, 1880-1940. Albany: State U of New York P, 2001.

---. A History of Professional Writing Instruction in American Colleges: Years of Acceptance, Growth, and Doubt. SMU Studies in Composition and Rhetoric. Ed. Gary Tate. Dallas: Southern Methodist U P, 1993.

---. Progressive Politics and the Training of America's Persuaders. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1999.

AEJMC: 75 Years in the Making. Journalism Monographs. Ed. Joseph P. McKerns. Vol. 104. Columbia, SC: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 1987.

Anderson, Rob, Robert Dardenne, and George M. Killenberg. "The American Newspaper as the Public Conversational Commons." Black, J. 96-115.

Antczak, Frederick J. Thought and Character: The Rhetoric of Democratic Education. Ames: Iowa State U P, 1985.

---, and Edith Siemers. "The Divergence of Purpose and Practice on the Chautauqua: Keith Vawter's Self-Defense." Clark and Halloran 208-25.

Arendt, Hannah. The Human Condition. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1958.

Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics. Trans. Martin Ostwald. Library of Liberal Arts. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1962.

Aristotle. Rhetoric and Poetics. 1954. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater. Intro. Edward P. J. Corbett. 1st ed. Modern Library. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Atwill, Janet M. Rhetoric Reclaimed: Aristotle and the Liberal Arts Tradition. Rhetoric and Society. Ed. Wayne A. Rebhorn. Ithaca, NY: Cornell U P, 1998.

Baker, Ray Stannard. Native American: The Book of My Youth. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.

Baldasty, Gerald J. The Commercialization of News in the Nineteenth Century. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1992.

Bare, John Bowman. "Toward a Definition of Public Journalism (Newspapers)." PhD Thesis. U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1995.

Beasley, Maurine Hoffman, and Kathryn T. Theus. The New Majority: A Look at What the Preponderance of Women in Journalism Education Means to the Schools and to the Professions. U of Maryland, College Park, College of Journalism, Women's Project. Lanham, MD: U P of America, 1988.

Beltz, Lynda. "Never Too Old for New Ventures: Ida M. Tarbell's "Second Profession". The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 99.4 (1975): 476-89.

Bennet, James. "The North Carolina Media Try to Lead Politics to Issues." The New York Times 24 Sept. 1996, sec. A: 1. Lexis-Nexis. Internet. 2 Apr. 1998. Available http://www.lib.utexas.edu/Indexes/L.

Bennett, Stephen Earl. "Political Talk Radio Shows' Impact on Democratic Citizenship." Johnson, Hays, and Hays, eds. 111-21.

Berkowitz, Dan, ed. Social Meanings of News: A Text-Reader. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997.

Berlin, James A. Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985. Studies in Writing and Rhetoric. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 1987.

---. Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges. Studies in Writing and Rhetoric. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 1984.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "Rhetoric and Public Knowledge." Rhetoric, Philosophy, and Literature: An Exploration. Ed. Don M. Burks. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue U P, 1978. 67-94.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg, eds. The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present. Boston: Bedford, 1990.

Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." The Quarterly Journal of Speech 56.2 (1970): 109-19.

Black, Jay, ed. Mixed News: The Public/Civic/Communitarian Journalism Debate. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1997.

Blair, Hugh. Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. 1783. The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately. 1968. Eds. James L. Golden and Edward P. J. Corbett. Landmarks in Rhetoric and Public Address. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 1990. 28-137.

Bledstein, Burton J. The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976.

Boyte, Harry C. "Public Opinion as Public Judgment." Glasser and Salmon 417-436.

Brady, Kathleen. Ida Tarbell: Portrait of a Muckraker. New York: Seaview-Putnam, 1984.

Brereton, John C., ed. The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925: A Documentary. Pittsburgh, PA: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995.

Brumm, John L. "The Department of Journalism." Shaw II: 622-26.

Burke, Kenneth. "From A Grammar of Motives." 1945. The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: Bedford, 1990. 992-1017.

---. A Rhetoric of Motives. Prentice-Hall, 1950. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969.

Camhi, Jane Jerome. Women against Women: American Anti-Suffragism, 1880-1920. Scholarship in Women's History: Rediscovered and New, Vol. 4. Ed. Gerda Lerner. New York: Carlson, 1994.

Campbell, JoAnn, ed. Toward a Feminist Rhetoric: The Writing of Gertrude Buck. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1996.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. Man Cannot Speak for Her: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric. Contributions in Women's Studies, Number 101. 2 vols. New York: Greenwood P, 1989.

---. "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron." Quarterly Journal of Speech 59 (1973): 74-86.

Campbell, W. Joseph Yellow Journalism: Puncturing the Myths, Defining the Legacies. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001.

Cappella, Joseph N., and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. Spiral of Cynicism: The Press and the Public Good. New York: Oxford U P, 1997.

Carey, James W. "Community, Public, and Journalism." Mixed News: The Public/Civic/ Communitarian Journalism Debate. Ed. Jay Black. LEA's Communication Ser. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997. 1-15.

---. "The Mass Media and Democracy: Between the Modern and the Postmodern." Journal of International Affairs 47.1 (1993): 1-21. Online. Expanded Academic ASAP. SearchBank. 24 Apr. 1998.

---. "The Press and Public Discourse." Center Magazine 20 (1983): 4-16.

---. "The Press, Public Opinion, and Public Discourse." Public Opinion and the Communication of Consent. Eds. Theodore L. Glasser and Charles T. Salmon. Guilford Communication Series. New York: Guilford P, 1995. 373-401.

Carlin, Diana B. E-mail to the author. 11 April 2002.

Clark, Gregory, and S. Michael Halloran. "Introduction: Transformations of Public Discourse in Nineteenth-Century America." Clark and Halloran, eds. 1-26.

---, eds. Oratorical Culture in Nineteenth-Century America. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 1993.

Cmiel, Kenneth. Democratic Eloquence: The Fight over Popular Speech in Nineteenth-Century America. 1st ed. New York: W. Morrow, 1990.

Cloud, Dana L. Control and Consolation in American Culture and Politics: Rhetorics of Therapy. Rhetoric and Society. Ed. Herbert W. Simons. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998.

Cohen, Herman. The History of Speech Communication: The Emergence of a Discipline, 1914-1945. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1994.

Coleman, Renita. "The Intellectual Antecedents of Public Journalism." Journal of Communication Inquiry 21.1 (1997): 60-77. Online. Expanded Academic ASAP. SearchBank. 5 Nov. 1998.

Commission on Presidential Debates. "DebateWatch: Welcome." http:// www.debates.org/pages/debwatch.html (13 May 2002).

Compton, James R. "Communicative Politics and Public Journalism." MA Thesis. Simon Fraser University, 1996.

Connors, Robert J. Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy. Pittsburgh Ser. in Composition, Literacy, and Culture. Eds. David Bartholomae and Jean Ferguson Carr. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1997.

Corbett, Edward P. J., and Rosa A. Eberly. The Elements of Reasoning. 1991. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.

Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University. "Innocence Project." http://www.cardozo.yu.edu/innocence_project/ (13 May 2002).

Corrigan, Don. "Public Journalism Undermines SPJ (Society of Professional Journalists) Ethics." St. Louis Journalism Review 29.212 (1998): 1-2.

Crowley, Sharon. Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays. Pittsburgh Ser. in Composition, Literacy, and Culture. Eds. David Bartholomae and Jean Ferguson Carr. Pittsburgh, PA: U of Pittsburgh P, 1998.

---. The Methodical Memory : Invention in Current-Traditional Rhetoric. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois U P, 1990.

Curran, James. "Rethinking the Media as a Public Sphere." Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere in the New Media Age. Eds. Peter Dahlgren and Colin Sparks. Communication and Society. New York: Routledge, 1991. 27-57.

Dahlgren, Peter. "Introduction." Dahlgren, Peter, and Colin Sparks, eds. Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere in the New Media Age. Communication and Society. London: Routledge, 1991. 1-26.

Dewey, John. The Public and Its Problems. 1927. Athens, OH: Swallow Press, 1954.

Eberly, Rosa A. Citizen Critics: Public Deliberations on Literature, Censorship, and Democracy. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2000.

---. "From Writers, Audiences, and Communities to Publics: Writing Classrooms as Protopublic Spaces." Rhetoric Review 18.1 (1999): 165-178.

---. "Radio Rhetorics." Course description for RHE 330C, Computers and Language, Division of Rhetoric and Composition, U of Texas at Austin. http://www.drc.utexas.edu/courses/ (16 May 2002).

---, and Gerard A. Hauser. "Introduction." Rhetoric's Road Trip: Mapping Rhetoric's Institutional Histories in the Twentieth-Century United States. Eds. Rosa A. Eberly and Gerard A. Hauser, forthcoming.

Ede, Lisa, and Andrea Lunsford. "Audience Addressed/ Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy." College Composition and Communication 35.2 (1984): 155-71.

Ettema, James S., and Theodore L. Glasser. Custodians of Conscience: Investigative Journalism and Public Virtue. New York: Columbia U P, 1998.

Ettema, James S., D. Charles Whitney, with Daniel B. Wackman. "Professional Mass Communicators." Handbook of Communication Science. Eds. C. H. Berger and S. H. Chaffee. London: Sage, 1987. 747-80. Berkowitz 31-50.

Evensen, Bruce J. "The Muckrakers as Evangelicals." Miraldi, Muckrakers 1-24.

Ferreira-Buckley, Linda, and Winifred Bryan Horner. "Writing Instruction in Great Britain: The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." Murphy, ed. A Short History 173-212.

Filler, Louis. Muckraking and Progressivism in the American Tradition. Contributions in American Studies. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1996. Rpt. of Appointment at Armageddon. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 1976.

Fishkin, James. The Voice of the People. New Haven: Yale U P, 1995.

Fitzpatrick, Ellen F. "Conclusion: Muckraking and Its Aftermath." Muckraking: Three Landmark Articles. Ed. Ellen F. Fitzpatrick. Bedford Ser. in History and Culture. Boston: Bedford-St. Martin's, 1994. 103-16.

Fouhy, Ed. "The Dawn of Public Journalism." National Civic Review 83.Summer-Fall (1994): 259-66.

Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Ser. in Contemporary German Social Thought. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1992. 109-42.

Gans, Herbert J. Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek and Time. 1979. New York: Random House-Vintage, 1980.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. Writing Groups: History, Theory and Implicaitons. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 1987.

Glasser, Theodore L. "Communication and the Cultivation of Citizenship." Communication 12 (1991): 235-48.

---, and Charles T. Salmon, eds. Public Opinion and the Communication of Consent. New York: Guilford Press, 1995.

Glenn, Cheryl. Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity through the Renaissance. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois U P, 1997.

Golden, James L., Goodwin F. Berquist, and William E. Coleman. The Rhetoric of Western Thought. 1976. 6th ed. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1997.

Goodnight, G. Thomas. "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation." Journal of the American Forensic Association 18.Spring (1982): 214-27.

---. "A Translation of Habermas on the Public Sphere." Rev. of The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. By Jürgen Habermas. Argumentation and Advocacy 28.3 (1992): 145-47.

Graff, Gerald. Professing Literature: An Institutional History. 1987. Paperback ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1989.

Grapsy, Ronald P. "American Civic Communication: The Duties of Citizenship." Syllabus for SPE 380: Special Topics, Department of Communication, Northern Kentucky U. E-mail to the author. 16 April 2002.

Gray, Giles Wilkeson. "Some Teachers and the Transition to Twentieth-Century Speech Education." Wallace 422-46.

Gross, Alan G. The Rhetoric of Science. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Harvard U P, 1996.

Habermas, Jürgen. The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. 1962. Trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. Boston: MIT, 1989. 1996.

Halloran, S. Michael. "From Rhetoric to Composition: The Teaching of Writing in America to 1900." A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Twentieth-Century America. Ed. James J. Murphy. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1990. 151-82.

---. "Rhetoric in the American College Curriculum: The Decline of Public Discourse." PRE/TEXT 3.3 (1982): 245-64.

Hamilton, Edith. Mythology. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1942.

Hart, Roderick P. Seducing America: How Television Charms the Modern Voter. Revised ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1999.

Hartsock, John C. A History of American Literary Journalism: The Emergence of a Modern Narrative Form. Amherst, MA: U of Massachusetts P, 2000.

Hauser, Gerard A. "Aristotle on Epideictic: The Formation of Public Morality." Rhetoric Society Quarterly 29.1 (1999): 5-24.

---. Vernacular Voices: Rhetorics of Publics and Public Spheres. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1999.

Hill, Forbes I. "Aristotle's Rhetorical Theory. With a Synopsis of Aristotle's Rhetoric." Murphy and Katula 51-109.

Hobbs, Catherine, ed. Nineteenth-Century Women Learn to Write. Feminist Issues: Practice, Politics, Theory. Eds. Alison Booth and Ann Lane. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1995.

Hochmuth, Marie, and Richard Murphy. "Rhetorical and Elocutionary Training in Nineteenth-Century Colleges." Wallace 153-77.

Howell, Wilbur Samuel. Eighteenth-Century British Logic and Rhetoric. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1971.

---. "English Backgrounds of Rhetoric." Wallace 1-47.

Humphreys, W. R. "The Department of English Language and Literature." Shaw II: 545-57.

Isocrates. "From Antidosis." Trans. George Norlin. Bizzell and Herzberg 50-54.

Jarratt, Susan C. Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois U P, 1991.

Johns, Ann M. Text, Role, and Context: Developing Academic Literacies. Cambridge Applied Linguistics Ser. New York: Cambridge U P, 1997.

Johnson, Thomas J., Carol E. Hays, and Scott P. Hays. "Engaging the Public: An Agenda for Reform." Johnson, Hays, and Hays, eds. 217-34.

---, eds. Engaging the Public: How Government and the Media Can Reinvigorate American Democracy. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998.

Johnstone, Henry W., Jr. "Rationality and Rhetoric in Philosophy." The Quarterly Journal of Speech 59.4 (1973): 381-89.

Kahn, Seth. "Writing as Civic Action." Syllabus for WRT 305, Syracuse U. "Teaching Public Participation," H-Rhetor listserve. 11 April 2002.

Katula, Richard A. "Greek Democracy and the Study of Rhetoric." Murphy and Katula 3-15.

---, and James J. Murphy. "The Sophists and Rhetorical Consciousness." A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric. Eds. James J. Murphy and Richard A. Katula. 2nd ed. Davis, CA: Hermagoras P, 1994. 17-50.

Katz, Elihu. "Introduction: The State of the Art." Glasser and Salmon xxi-xxxiv.

Keith, William. "Identity, Rhetoric and Myth: A Response to Mailloux and Leff." Rhetoric Society Quarterly 20.4 (2000): 95-106.

Kerber, Linda K. "The Republican Mother: Women and the Enlightenment--an American Perspective." American Quarterly 28 (1976): 187-205. Rpt. in Toward an Intellectual History of Women: Essays. Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina P, 1997. 41-62.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900. SMU Studies in Composition and Rhetoric. Ed. Gary Tate. Dallas: Southern Methodist U P, 1990.

Kochersberger, Robert C., Jr., ed. More Than a Muckraker: Ida Tarbell's Lifetime in Journalism. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1994.

Kraeplin, Camille Renee. "The Role of the Editorial Page in Newspaper-Based Public Journalism Projects." PhD Thesis. U of Texas at Austin, 1998.

Lambeth, Edmund B. "Public Journalism as Democratic Practice." Assessing Public Journalism. Eds. Edmund B. Lambeth, Philip E. Meyer and Esther Thorson. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1998. 15-35.

Lanham, Richard A. A Handlist of Rhetoric Terms. 2nd ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.

Leff, Michael. "Rhetorical Criticism in Composition Studies and Communication Studies: Two Worlds or One." Professing Rhetoric, Rhetoric Society of America Conference. Washington, D.C., 2000.

---. "Rhetorical Disciplines and Rhetorical Disciplinarity: A Response to Mailloux." Rhetoric Society Quarterly 20.4 (2000): 83-93.

Lippmann, Walter. Public Opinion. 1922. New York: Macmillan, 1941.

Lounsbury, Thomas Raynesford. "Compulsory Composition in Colleges." Harper's Monthly 123 (1911). Brereton 261-86.

Lunsford, Andrea A., ed. Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995.

Mailloux, Steven. "Disciplinary Identities: On the Rhetorical Paths between English and Communication Studies." Rhetoric Society Quarterly 20.1 (2000): 5-30.

Martin, Christopher Robert. "Working in the News: Public Journalism, the Consumer Sphere, and Coverage of Labor-Management Conflict." PhD Thesis. University of Michigan, 1995.

McCarthy, Thomas. "Introduction." Habermas xi-xiv.

McChesney, Robert W. Rich Media, Poor Democracy: Communications Politics in Dubious Times. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1999.

McCombs, Maxwell, Lucig Danielian, and Wayne Wanta. "Issues in the News and the Public Agenda: The Agenda-Setting Tradition." Salmon and Glasser 281-300.

McDeavitt, Michael, and Steven H. Chaffee. "Second Chance Political Socialization: 'Trickle-up' Effects of Children on Parents." Johnson, Hays, and Hays, eds. 57-66.

McHenry, Elizabeth. "'Dreaded Eloquence': The Origins and Rise of African American Literary Societies and Libraries." Harvard Library Bulletin 6.2 (1995): 32-56.

McKeon, Richard. "Creativity and the Commonplace." Rhetoric: Essays in Invention and Discovery. Woodbridge, CT: Ox Box Press, 1987. 25-36.

McLeod, Jack M., William P. Eveland, Jr., and Edward M. Horowitz. "Going Beyond Adults and Voter Turnout: Evaluating a Socialization Program Involving Schools, Family and Media." Johnson, Hays, and Hays, eds. 195-205.

Merritt, Davis "Buzz." Public Journalism and Public Life: Why Telling the News Is Not Enough. LEA's Communication Ser. Eds. Jennings Bryant and Dolf Zillmann. 2nd. ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.

---. "Public Journalism and Public Life." National Civic Review 84.3 (1995): 262-66. http: www. web4.searchbank.ocm/infotrac (2 Apr. 1998).

Meyer, Philip, and Deborah Potter. "Hidden Value: Polls and Public Journalism." Election Polls, the News Media, and Democracy. Eds. Paul J. Lavrakas and Michael W. Traugott. New York: Chatham House, 1999.

Miller, Thomas P. The Formation of College English: Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in the American College, 1875-1925: A Documentary History. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995.

Mindich, David T. Z. Just the Facts: How "Objectivity" Came to Define American Journalism. New York: New York U P, 1999.

Miraldi, Robert. Muckraking and Objectivity: Journalism's Colliding Traditions. Contributions to the Study of Mass Media and Communications, Number 18. Ed. Bernard K. Johnpoll. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 1990.

---, ed. The Muckrakers: Evangelical Crusaders. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.

Mountford, Roxanne. "Looking for Rhetoric in the Graduate Research Methods Course." Conference on College Composition and Communication. Minneapolis, MN, 2000.

Murphy, James J. "The Codification of Roman Rhetoric. With a Synopsis of the Rhetorica ad Herennium." Murphy and Katula 111-27.

---. Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory Form Saint Augustine to the Renaissance. 1974. Paperback ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1981.

---. "The Key Role of Habit in Roman Writing Instruction." Murphy, ed. A Short History 35-78.

---, ed. A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum-Hermagoras P, 2001.

---, and Richard A. Katula, eds . A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric. 2nd ed. Davis, CA: Hermagoras P, 1995.

Myers, Greg. Writing Biology: Texts in the Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge. Science and Literature. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin P, 1990.

O'Dell, De Forest. The History of Journalism Education in the United States. 1935. PhD Thesis. Columbia University Teachers College, Contributions to Education, No. 653. New York: AMS, 1972.

Paine, Charles. The Resistant Writer: Rhetoric as Immunity, 1850 to the Present. SUNY Ser., Literacy, Culture, and Learning: Theory and Practice. Ed. Alan C. Purves. Albany, NY: State U of New York P, 1999.

Pattee, Fred Lewis. "The Old Professor of English: An Autopsy." Tradition and Jazz. New York: Century, 1925.

Phelps, William Lyon. "English Composition." Teaching in School and College. New York: Macmillan, 1912. Brereton 287-91.

Pinkleton, Bruce E., and Erica Weintraub Austin. "Media and Participation: Breaking the Spiral of Disaffection." Johnson, Hays, and Hays, eds. 75-86.

Plato. Phaedrus. Trans. H. N. Fowler. Bizzell and Herzberg 113-43.

Poulakos, Takis. Speaking for the Polis: Isocrates' Rhetorical Education. Studies in Rhetoric/Communication. Ed. Thomas W. Benson. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1997.

Reeder, Ellen D., ed. Pandora: Women in Classical Greece. Princeton, NJ: Princeton U P, 1995.

Reid, Ronald F. "The Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory, 1806-1904: A Case Study in Changing Concepts of Rhetoric and Pedagogy." The Quarterly Journal of Speech XLV.3 (1959): 239-57.

Roberts-Miller, Patricia. "Communitarianism and Communities of Discourse." Division of Rhetoric and Composition, The University of Texas at Austin, April 2000.

Rosen, Jay. "Beyond Objectivity." Nieman Reports 47.4 (1993): 48-53.

---. "Public Journalism: A Case for Public Scholarship." Change 27.May-Jun. (1995): 34-38.

---. "Public Journalism: First Principles." Public Journalism: Theory and Practice. Eds. Jay Rosen and Merritt Davis, Jr.: Kettering Foundation Occasional Paper, 1994. 6-18.

---. Getting the Connections Right: Public Journalism and the Troubles in the Press. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1996.

Schaffer, Jan, and Edward D. Miller, eds. Civic Journalism: Six Case Studies. Washington, D.C.: Pew Center for Civic Journalism, Tides Foundation, 1995.

Schiller, Dan. Objectivity and the News: The Public and the Rise of Commercial Journalism. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1981.

Schroll, Christopher Joseph. "Toward a Rhetorical Conception of Public Journalism (Editorial Activism)." PhD Thesis. University of Georgia, 1996.

Schudson, Michael. Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers. New York: Basic, 1978.

---. The Good Citizen. New York: Basic Books, 1998.

---. The Power of News. Cambridge, MA and London: Cambridge U P, 1995.

---. "The Sociology of News Production." Media, Culture & Society 11 (1989): 263-82. Berkowitz 7-22.

---. "Was There Ever a Public Sphere? If So, When? Reflections on the American Case." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: MIT P, 1992. 143-63.

Scott, Fred Newton. "College Entrance Requirements in English." School Review 9 (June 1901): 365-78.

---. "The Colloquial Nasals." Journal of Education (London, Nov. 1923). "The Standard of American Speech" 272-78.

---. "English Composition as a Mode of Behavior." English Journal 11 (Oct. 1922). "The Standard of American Speech" and Other Papers 19-32.

---. "The Genesis of Speech." President's Address, Modern Language Association, 26 Dec. 1907. "The Standard of American Speech" 312-45.

---. "Poetry in a Commercial Age." English Journal 10 (Dec. 1921). "The Standard of American Speech" 98-111.

---. "The Report on College Entrance Requirements in English." Educational Review 20 (Oct. 1900): 289-94.

---. "Rhetoric Rediviva." Ed. Donald Stewart. College Composition and Communication 31.4 (Dec. 1980): 413-19.

---. "The Standard of American Speech." Address to National Council of Teachers of English. New York, 1 Dec. 1916. English Journal 6 (Jan. 1917). "The Standard of American Speech" and Other Papers 1-15.

---. "The Standard of American Speech" and Other Papers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1926.

---. "Training for Journalism." Paper. n.d. Fred Newton Scott Papers, Bentley Historical Library, Ann Arbor, MI.

---. "Two Ideals of Teaching Composition." Address to Indiana Association of Teachers of English, Nov. 11, 1911. Proceedings, 1911. "The Standard of American Speech" 35-47.

---. "Verbal Taboos." School Review 20 (June 1912). "The Standard of American Speech" 165-90.

Semonche, John E. "The 'American Magazine' of 1906-15: Principle vs. Profit." Journalism Quarterly 40.1 (1963): 36-44.

Shaw, Wilfred B., ed. The University of Michigan: An Encyclopedic Survey. 4 vols. Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 1951.

Siebert, Fred S. "The Authoritarian Theory." Siebert, Peterson, and Schramm 9-37.

---. "The Libertarian Theory." Siebert, Peterson, and Schramm 39-71.

---, Theodore Peterson, and Wilbur Schramm. Four Theories of the Press. 1956. Illini Books ed. Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P, 1963.

Stewart, Donald C. "The Barnyard Goose, History, and Fred Newton Scott." The English Journal 67 (Nov. 1978): 14-17.

---. "Rediscovering Fred Newton Scott." College English 40 (1979): 539-47.

---. “Two Model Teachers and the Harvardization of English Departments.” The Rhetorical Tradition and Modern Writing. Ed. James J. Murphy. New York: MLA, 1982. 118-29.

---, ed. “Rhetoric Rediviva.” By Fred Newton Scott. College Composition and Communication 31.4 (1980): 413-19.

---, and Patricia L. Stewart. The Life and Legacy of Fred Newton Scott. Pittsburgh Series in Composition, Literacy, and Culture. Eds. David Bartholomae and Jean Ferguson Carr. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1997.

Stewart, Patricia L. Letter to the author. 27 Sep. 2000.

Stinson, Robert. "Ida M. Tarbell and the Ambiguities of Feminism." The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 101.2 (1977): 217-39.

“Students Contributed to DNA Exonerations.” Inside Medill News. 25 Jan. 2002. http://www.medill.northwestern.edu/inside/2002/protess-dna.html (13 May 2002).

Summers, Mark Wahlgren. The Press Gang: Newspapers and Politics, 1865-1878. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1994.

Sutton, Albert Alton. Education for Journalism in the United States from Its Beginning to 1940. Evanston, IL: Northwestern U P, 1945.

Swales, John M. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge Applied Linguistics Ser. New York: Cambridge U P, 1990.

Tarbell, Ida M. All in the Day's Work. New York: MacMillan, 1939. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1985.

---. The Business of Being a Woman. New York: Macmillan, 1912.

---. The History of the Standard Oil Company. 1904. New York: Peter Smith, 1950.

---. "A Little Look at the People." Atlantic Monthly May 1917: 602-10.

---. The Tariff in Our Times. New York: MacMillan, 1911.

---. "Women in Journalism." The Chautauquan 7 (Apr. 1887): 393-95. Kochersberger 138-45.

Thorpe, Clarence D. "The Department of Rhetoric." Shaw II: 558-69.

Tomkins, Mary E. Ida M. Tarbell. Twayne's United States Authors Ser., TUSAS 247. New York: Twayne, 1974.

Tonkovich, Nicole. "Rhetorical Power in the Victorian Parlor: Godey's Lady's Book and the Gendering of Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric." Clark and Halloran 158-83.

Treckel, Paula. Ida Tarbell and "The Business of Being a Woman." 12 September 2000. 1997. Pelletier Library, Allegheny College. http://tarbell.alleg.edu/treckel.html. 11 July 2001.

Trubey, Lillian P. The Public Speaking Career of Ida M. Tarbell. PhD Thesis. Florida State U, 1972.

Veysey, Laurence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: Phoenix Books, U of Chicago P, 1965.

Wallace, Karl R., ed. History of Speech Education in America. New York: Speech Association of America, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Wander, Philip. "The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory." Central States Speech Journal 35. Winter (1984): 197-216.

Weaver, Richard M. The Ethics of Rhetoric. Regnery/Gateway, 1953. Davis, CA: Hermagoras P, 1985.

Weinberg, Arthur, and Lila Weinberg, eds. The Muckrakers. 1961. New York: Capricorn, 1964.

Weinberg, Steve. "Ida Tarbell, Patron Saint." Columbia Journalism Review. May/June (2001): 29.

---. E-mail to the author. 8 July 2001.

Welter, Barbara. "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1800-1860." American Quarterly 1966. Dimity Convictions: The American Woman in the Nineteenth Century. Athens, OH: Ohio U P, 1976. 21-41.

Williams, Sara Lockwood. Twenty Years of Education for Journalism: A History of the School of Journalism of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, U. S. A. Columbia, MO: E. W. Stephens, 1929.

White, David Manning. "The "Gate Keeper": A Case Study in the Selection of News." Journalism Quarterly 27 (1950): 383-96. Berkowitz 63-71.

Winterowd, W. Ross. The English Department: A Personal and Institutional History. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P, 1998.

Wright, Elizabethada A., and S. Michael Halloran. "From Rhetoric to Composition: The Teaching of Writing in America to 1900." Murphy, ed. A Short History 213-46.

Yankelovich, Daniel. Coming to Public Judgment: Making Democracy Workin a Complex World. Syracuse: Syracuse U P, 1991.

Young, Richard E. "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention." Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Eds. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1978. 29-48.

Zaeske, Susan. "Signatures of Citizenship: The Rhetoric of Women's Antislavery Petitions." Quarterly Journal of Speech 88.2 (2002): 147-68.

Zang, Barbara. "A Possible Press: Participatory Journalism and the Case of 'the Sun' (Bremerton, Washington, Newspapers)." PhD Thesis. Indiana University, 1997.

Zelizer, Barbie. "Journalists as Interpretive Communities." Critical Studies in Mass Communication 10 (1993): 219-37. Rpt. in Berkowitz 401-419.

Vita

Sharan Leigh Daniel was born 4 July 1958 in Indianapolis, Indiana, to M. Lynn and Helen M. Daniel. She graduated from Simsbury High School in Simsbury, Connecticut, in 1976, and received a Bachelor of Arts degree in journalism from Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, in 1980. Upon graduation from college, she served in the U.S. Army, retiring as a major in 1996. While on active duty she received a Master of Arts degree in English literature from Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana, in 1987. Her teaching experience includes three years in the English department at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, New York; three years in the Division of Rhetoric and Composition at The University of Texas at Austin; and one year in the Intellectual Entrepreneurship Program in the Office of Graduate Studies at The University of Texas at Austin.

Permanent address: 1615 Hermann Drive, Apartment 1223, Houston, Texas 77004.

This dissertation was typed by the author.